arXiv:1610.00351v1 [math.DG] 2 Oct 2016

Quantitative stratification of stationary Yang-Mills fields

Yu Wang*

October 4, 2016

Abstract: In this paper we study the singular set of a stationary Yang-Mills connection A and prove the rectifiability of the k^{th} stratification $S^k(A)$ for all integer k, the set where no tangent measure is $k+1$-symmetric. In order to do this we introduce the quantitative stratification $S^k_{\epsilon,r}(A)$ by using the notion of quantitative symmetry. The rectifiability result is based on the Minkowski volume estimates of such quantitative stratification.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
- 1.1 Basics . . . 2
- 1.2 Quantitative Symmetry . . . 3
- 1.3 Quantitative Stratification . . . 6
- 1.4 Main Results . . . 8
- 1.5 Acknowledgements . . . 11

2 Rectifiable-Reifenberg Theorem **11**

3 L^2-Approximation Theorem **12**
- 3.1 Energy Decay Function . . . 12
- 3.2 L^2-Approximation Theorem . . . 12
- 3.3 Energy Lower bound . . . 12
- 3.4 Proof of Theorem 3.2.1 . . . 15

4 An Inductive Covering Lemma **16**
- 4.1 Energy Scale . . . 17
- 4.2 Key Lemma . . . 17
- 4.3 Estimates of U_{good} for $r > 0$ . . . 18
- 4.4 Estimates of $U_{good}(0)$ . . . 20
- 4.5 Estimates of U_{bad} . . . 21
- 4.6 Reduction to Estimates of I_a . . . 22
- 4.7 Completion of Proving Key Lemma 4.2.1 . . . 23
- 4.8 Proof of Claim 4.6.1 . . . 26

*The author is a graduate student in Department of Mathematics, Northwestern University. Contact Email: sidywang@math.northwestern.edu

5 Completion of the Proofs of the Main Results **30**
5.1 Energy Drop Induction 31
5.2 Proof of Item 1) 32
5.3 Proof of Item 2) 34
5.4 Proof of Item 3) 35
5.5 Proof of Theorem 1.4.1 35
5.6 Proof of Theorem 1.4.2 and 1.4.3 35
5.7 Proof of Theorem 1.4.6 36

6 References **37**

1 Introduction

1.1 Basics

In this paper, we shall work with connections A defined on principal bundle P over a ball $B(p,16)$, such that either of the following holds:

a) A is smooth Yang-Mills away from a measure zero singular set $S(A)$; its curvature F_A, which is defined on $B(p,16)\backslash S$, satisfies:

$$\int_{B(p,16)\backslash S(A)} |F_A|^2(x)dV_g(x) < \infty$$

b) A is weakly Yang-Mills on $B(p,16)$; its curvature F_A, as a distribution, happens to be $\mathfrak{g}_P$-valued two form that satisfies:

$$\int_{B(p,16)} |F_A|^2(x)dV_g(x) < \infty$$

moreover, in both cases, we require that A satisfies the following stationarity equation:

$$\int_{B(p,16)} \left(|F_A|^2 divX - 4 \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \langle F_A(\nabla_{e_i} X, e_j), F_A(e_i, e_j) \rangle \right) dV_g = 0 \tag{1}$$

where X is any vector field compactly supported in $B(p,16)$ and $\{e_i\}$ denote arbitrary orthonormal frame on $B(p,16)$. Throughout the paper, we refer to the connections in either cases above as stationary Yang-Mills connections. We note that in the rest of the paper we will only need the stationary equation (1) and the L^2 boundedness on curvature; the (weak) Yang-Mills equation is indeed unnecessary in this paper.

One special case of particular interest is the stationary connection which is also admissible, defined as follows (see also [G. Tian] and [T. Tao, G. Tian]):

Definition 1.1.1. *A connection A is said to be admissible Yang-Mills in a ball $B(p,16)$, if A is smoothly defined and satisfies the Yang-Mills equation on $B(p,16)\backslash S(A)$ with $H^{n-4}(S(A) \cap K) < \infty$ for any compact set $K \subset B(p,16)$. Moreover we assume that the curvature F_A, which is defined on $B(p,16)\backslash S(A)$, satisfies: $\int_{B(p,16)\backslash S(A)} |F_A|^2(x)dV_g(x) < \infty$*

It should be remarked that, results in this paper hold on general manifolds, though, for brevity we will always take $M = \mathbb{R}^n$. Indeed, since all objects will only be studied locally, the geometry in Riemannian case only plays a rather minor role and mainly contributes to unnecessary technical trivia if taken into consideration, such as the small exponential error in formulae such as (2) and (8) shown below. In order to focus on addressing the key issues and carrying out the idea in a clean manner we hence decide to be less pedantic and always take $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ in the proofs while stating all results for general manifolds M.

We will adopt the following notation of energy function:

$$\theta_r(x) = r^{4-n} \int_{B(x,r)} |F_A(x)|^2 dV_g$$

where $F_A(x)$ denotes the curvature of A.

From [P. Price], equation (1) on $\mathbb{R}^n$ yields the following consequence:

$$\rho^{4-n} \int_{B_\rho(0)} |F_A|^2 dV_g - \sigma^{4-n} \int_{B_\sigma(0)} |F_A|^2 dV_g = \int_{A_{(\sigma,\rho)}(0)} 4|x|^{4-n} |\iota_{\partial r} F_A|^2 dV_g \tag{2}$$

We infer from this immediately that the scaling invariant energy quantity $\theta_r(x)$ is monotone nondecreasing in r.

In general, from [G. Tian], given a function $\phi(\theta)$ on the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho^{4-n} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \phi |F_A|^2 dV_g - \sigma^{4-n} \int_{B_\sigma(0)} \phi |F_A|^2 dV_g \\ &= \int_{A_{(\sigma,\rho)}(0)} 4|x|^{4-n} \phi |\iota_{\partial r} F_A|^2 dV_g - \int_\sigma^\rho 4\tau^{3-n} \Big(\int_{B_\tau(0)} |x| \langle \iota_{\partial r} F_A, \iota_{\nabla \phi} F_A \rangle dV_g \Big) d\tau \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

1.2 Quantitative Symmetry

We could now start to introduce the following definitions of homogeneity and quantitative homogeneity of a stationary connection A with bounded L^2-energy:

Definition 1.2.1 (Quantitative Homogeneity)**.** *Let P be a principal bundle over a geodesic ball $B(p, 16)$ of a manifold M; and let A be a connection on P with $\|F_A\|_{L^2(B(p,16))} \leq \Lambda$. Then for each integer k and any $B(x_0, r) \subset B(p, 16)$ we make the following definitions:*

i) *A is called k-homogeneous in $B(x_0, r)$, if there is a k-plane V_k through x_0 spanned by orthonormal basis $\{\partial z_i\}_{i=1}^k$, such that in $B(x_0, r)$ it holds:*

$$\iota_{\partial z_i} F_A(x) = 0$$

$$\iota_{\partial r_{x_0}} F_A(x) = 0$$

ii) *A is called (k,ϵ)-homogeneous in $B(x_0,r)$, if there is a k-plane V_k through x_0 spanned by orthonormal basis $\{\partial z_i\}_{i=1}^k$, such that:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} r^{4-n}\int_{B(x_0,r)}|\iota_{\partial z_i}F_A(x)|^2dV_g(x)<\epsilon$$

$$\int_{A_{(\epsilon r,r)}(x_0)}|x-x_0|^{4-n}|\iota_{\partial r_{x_0}}F_A(x)|^2dV_g(x)<\epsilon$$

In practice, however, we will frequently rely on a more adaptable definition of homogeneity; in order to distinguish the terminology of this alternative definition from the preceding term "homogeneity", we decide to name the new notion by "symmetry". Later we will show that when dimension $n\geq 5$, two definitons are essentially equivalent (see remark 1.2.7), while in other dimensions, "homogeneity" implies "symmetry" (see lemma 3.3.1).

Before stating the defnition of "symmetry" it is necessary to introduce the following useful notion of so-called "τr-effectively spanning", which also appeared in [FH. Lin], [G.Tian] and [A. Naber, D. Valtorta]:

Definition 1.2.2 (Effectively Spanning)**.** *We say that a k-plane V_k is τr-effectively spanned by $k+1$ points $x_0,\cdots,x_k$ w.r.t. $B(x_0,r)$, if $x_1,\cdots,x_k\in B(x_0,r/2)$ and $dist(x_{i+1},x_0+span\{x_1-x_0,\cdots,x_i-x_0\}\geq \tau r$ for $i=0,\cdots,k-1$.*

Definition 1.2.3 (Almost-Cone Tip)**.** *Let A be a connection with $\|F_A\|_{L^2(B(p,16))}\leq\Lambda$. x is called an (ϵ,r)-cone tip of A, if*

$$\int_{A_{(2\epsilon r,2r)}(x)}|y-x|^{4-n}|\iota_{\partial r_x}F_A(x)|^2dV_g(y)<\epsilon$$

x is called a strict r-cone tip of A if $\iota_{\partial r_x}F_A=0$ in $B(x,2r)$. Especially, if A is stationary, then x is an (ϵ,r)-cone tip of A iff $|\theta_{2r}(x)-\theta_{2\epsilon r}(x)|<\epsilon$, and x is a strict r-cone tip of A iff $\theta(x,s)$ is constant for all $0<s\leq 2r$.

Definition 1.2.4 (Quantitative Symmetry)**.** *Let P be a principal bundle over a geodesic ball $B(p,16)$ of a manifold M; and let A be a stationary connection on P with $\|F_A\|_{L^2(B(p,16))}\leq\Lambda$. Set $\tau(n):=20^{-10n}D(n)^{-1}$, where $D(n)$ is the same as in Theorem 2.0.4. Then for each integer k and any $B(x_0,r)\subset B(p,16)$ we make the following definitions:*

i) *A is called k-symmetric in $B(x_0,r)$, if there is a k-plane V_k through x_0 such that any $y\in V_k\cap B(x_0,r)$ is a strict r-cone tip of A.*

ii) *A is called (k,ϵ)-symmetric in $B(x_0,r)$, if there is a k-plane V_k through x_0 which is $\tau(n)r$-effectively spanned by (ϵ,r)-cone tips of A: $x_0,x_1,\cdots,x_k$ w.r.t. $B(x_0,r)$. Especially, A is $(0,\epsilon)$-symmetric in $B(x_0,r)$ iff x_0 is an (ϵ,r)-cone tip of A.*

Remark 1.2.5. *In this paper we often consider the $*$-weak limit measure μ of $\{|F_{A_i}|^2dV_g\}_i$, where A_i are stationary connections. Similar as definition 1.2.3 and 1.2.4, we could define the (ϵ,r)-cone tip and (k,ϵ)-symmetry of μ in precisely the same way by using $\theta_r^{(\mu)}(x):=r^{4-n}\mu(B(x,r))$.*

Remark 1.2.6. *For convinience take $B(p,1)$ to be a ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then both k-homogeneity and k-symmetry on $B(p,1)$ lead to the usual notion of k-symmetry of a connection, i.e. there is a smooth gauge σ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(A)(x+y) =&\sigma(A)(x),\ \forall x, x+y \in B(x_0,r) \text{ with } y \in V_k\\ \sigma(A)(\lambda(x-x_0)+x_0) =&\sigma(A)(x),\ \forall x, \lambda(x-x_0)+x_0 \in B(x_0,r) \text{ with } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

We shall check that k-symmetry implies k-homogeneity, which implies (4). Let's start with k-symmetry as in the second definition; we know from (2) that $\iota_{\partial r_x} F_A = 0$ for all $x \in B(x_0,r) \cap V_k$, where $r_x(\cdot) = dist(x,\cdot)$. Choose $x_1, \cdots, x_k \in B(x_0,r) \cap V_k$ such that $x_1 - x_0, \cdots, x_k - x_0$ forms a basis of V_k. Let $\nu_i = \frac{x_i - x_0}{|x_i - x_0|}$ and $r_i(\cdot) := dist(x_i,\cdot)$ for $i = 1, \cdots, k$. Note that we have the following relation thanks to the virtue of $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$d(x_0,z)\partial r_0 - d(x_0,x_i)\nu_i = d(x_i,z)\partial r_i,\ \forall z \in B(x_0,r) \tag{5}$$

From this we immediately have that

$$\begin{aligned}\iota_{\nu_i} F_A(z) \equiv 0 \text{ in } B(x_0,r)\\ \iota_{\partial r_0} F_A(z) \equiv 0 \text{ in } B(x_0,r)\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Let $x_1, \cdots, x_n$ be coordinates of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\partial_{x_1}, \cdots, \partial_{x_k}$ span V_k. This becomes k-homogeneity as in the first definition. From (6) it is then clear that we could find a gauge transform σ such that $\sigma(A)$ is independent of variables $x_i, \cdots, x_k$ and scaling invariant, which is exactly (4).

Remark 1.2.7. *We point out that: when dimension $n \geq 5$, $\forall \epsilon$, $\exists \delta$, such that (k,δ)-symmetry on $B(p,1)$ implies (k,ϵ)-homogeneity on $B(p,1)$; conversely, when dimension $n \geq 4$, $\forall \epsilon'$, $\exists \delta'$, such that (k,δ')-homogeneity on $B(p,4)$ implies (k,ϵ')-symmetry on $B(p,1)$. We show the first direction here, and leave the second direction to the proof of lemma 3.3.1. Let $\{x_0, \cdots, x_k\}$ be those (ϵ,r)-cone tips that are $\tau(n)r$-effectively spanning. By following the same step as in remark 1.2.6, we see that*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} r^{4-n} \int_{B(x_0,r)\setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{k} B(x_i,2\epsilon r)} |\iota_{\partial z_j} F_A|^2(x) dV_g(x) \lesssim \epsilon$$

due to the dimension condition that $n \geq 5$, the L^2 bound of F_A, and that $\theta_r(x)$ is monotone, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} r^{4-n} \int_{\bigcup_{i=0}^{k} B(x_i,2\epsilon r)} |\iota_{\partial z_j} F_A|^2(x) dV_g(x) \lesssim r^{4-n} \int_{\bigcup_{i=0}^{k} B(x_i,2\epsilon r)} |F_A|^2(x) dV_g(x) \lesssim \epsilon^{n-4}$$

we are done with the first direction.

Remark 1.2.8. *It is then easy to see that in both definitions ii) quantitatively generalize i). In the first one this is trivial. In the second one, by setting $\epsilon = 0$ we see that $\iota_{\partial r_{x_i}} F_A \equiv 0$ for $i = 0, \cdots, k$. Then we argue in the same way as in remark 1.2.6 to see that (6) holds, from which we see that this gives the usual symmetry (4).*

1.3 Quantitative Stratification

In this subsection we will define the quantitative stratification by using the definition of symmetry defined as above. Firstly we need some preliminaries on tangent measure.

Let's start with the following notion of scaled measure for any positive scale λ, $y \in M$ and $E \subset T_yM$:

$$\mu_{y,\lambda}(E) := \lambda^{n-4}\mu(\lambda \exp(E))$$

Definition 1.3.1 (Tangent Measure)**.** *We say η is a tangent measure of an stationary Yang-Mills connection A at the point p, if there exists a sequence of $\lambda_i \to 0$, such that $(|F_A|^2 dV_g)_{p,\lambda_i} \to \eta$ in the $*$-weak sense.*

The Lemma 5.3.1 in [G. Tian] shows that any tangent measure of stationary Yang-Mills connection is cone measure, i.e., $\eta_{0,\lambda} = \eta$, and furthermore obtained the rectifiability of the top stratum S^{n-4} of the limit measure μ that arises from a sequence of smooth Yang-Mills connections. In this paper this rectifiability result will be generalized to all S^k which is, roughly speaking, defined by:

$$S^k(\mu) = \{y \in B(p,1) : \text{ no tangent measure of } \mu \text{ at } y \text{ is independent of } k+1 \text{ variables}\}$$

Definition 1.3.2 (Quantitative Stratification)**.** *Let A be a connection satisfying $\int_{B(p,16)} |F_A|^2 dV_g \leq \Lambda$; then we make the following definitions:*

(1) *for each $\epsilon > 0$ and $r < 1$, the k^{th} (ϵ, r)-stratum $S^k_{\epsilon,r}(A)$ is defined to be the set*

$$S^k_{\epsilon,r}(A) = \left\{ y \in B(p,1) : B(y,s) \text{ is not } (k+1,\epsilon) \text{ -symmetric, } \forall r \leq s \leq 1 \right\}$$

(2) *for each $\epsilon > 0$, the k^{th} ϵ-stratum $S^k_\epsilon(A)$ is defined to be the set*

$$S^k_\epsilon(A) = \bigcap_{r>0} S^k_{\epsilon,r}(A) = \left\{ y \in B(p,1) : B(y,r) \text{ is not } (k+1,\epsilon)\text{-symmetric, } \forall 0 < r \leq 1 \right\}$$

(3) *for each k the k^{th} stratum $S^k(A)$ is defined to be $S^k(A) = \bigcup_{\epsilon>0} S^k_\epsilon(A)$.*

Remark 1.3.3. *Let μ be a $*$-weak limit measure of $\{|F_{A_i}|^2 dV_g\}_i$ where A_i are stationary connections. Then we shall define stratifications of μ in precisely the same way as above.*

The next proposition indicates that when A is stationary the notion of "k-symmetry" of the tangent measure coincides with the usual notion that the tangent measure is "independent of k variables". Hence the following holds for a stationary connection A:

$$S^k(A) = \{y \in B(p,1) : \text{ no tangent measure of } A \text{ at } y \text{ is independent of } k+1 \text{ variables}\}$$

Proposition 1.3.4. *Let η be a tangent measure of a stationary Yang-Mills connection A at point p. Then η is k-symmetric in $B(0,1) \subset T_pM$ if and only if η is independent of k variables as a measure in $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. We may w.l.o.g. assume that any tangent measure is a cone measure at the orgin. Make the following notation:

$$\theta_r^\infty(z_i) := r^{4-n}\eta(B(z_i, r))$$

similar as in 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 we could define the notion of cone tip and symmetry w.r.t. η in precisely the way.

Suppose η satisfies $\eta(z_1, \cdots, z_n) = \eta(z_{k+1}, \cdots, z_n)$, then obviously the measure is invariant under translation by vectors on the k-plane V_k spanned by $z_1, \cdots, z_k$ axis. As a matter of fact, $\theta_r^\infty(x) := r^{4-n}\eta(B(x, r))$ is constant in r for all $x \in V_k$, and hence is k-symmetric, due to the constancy of $\theta_r^\infty(0)$; this finishes the proof of one direction.

Now suppose that $(|F_A|^2 dV_g)_{\lambda_l, p} \to \eta$ in $*$-weak sense and that η is k-symmetric in $B(0, 1)$ w.r.t. V_k spanned by $k+1$ points $0, z_1, \cdots, z_k$ such that $|z_i 0| = 1/4$. From remark 1.2.6 we have:

$$\lim_{\lambda_l \to 0} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \int_{B(p,1)} |\iota_{\partial z_j} F_{A_{\lambda_l}}|^2(x) dV_{\lambda_l^{-2} g}(x) = 0$$

$$\lim_{\lambda_l \to 0} \int_{A_{(\sigma,\rho)}(p)} |x - p|^{4-n} |\iota_{\partial r_p} F_{A_{\lambda_l}}|^2(x) dV_{\lambda_l^{-2} g}(x) = 0 \text{ for any } \sigma,\ \rho$$

using this and (2) we obtain for any $y \in B(0, 1/2)$ and any $\sigma, \rho < 1/2$:

$$\theta_\rho^\infty(y) - \theta_\sigma^\infty(y) = \rho^{4-n}\eta(B(p, \rho)) - \sigma^{4-n}\eta(B(p, \sigma)) = \lim_{\lambda_l \to 0} \int_{A_{(\sigma,\rho)}(p)} 4|x - p|^{4-n} |\iota_{\partial r_p} F_{A_{\lambda_l}}|^2 dV_{\lambda_l^{-2} g}(x) = 0 \tag{7}$$

We first show that for $0, z_1, \cdots, z_k$, we have that $\theta_r^\infty(z_i)$ is constant in r. Choose any $r > 0$. By the fact that η is a cone measure at 0, we have for any number $\epsilon > 0$ that:

$$\theta_r^\infty(z_i) - \theta_{\frac{1}{2}}^\infty(z_i) = \theta_{\epsilon r}^\infty(\epsilon z_i) - \theta_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\infty(\epsilon z_i)$$

especially by choosing ϵ sufficiently small we could make $B(\epsilon z_i, \epsilon r) \subset B(p, 1/2)$; now apply (7) to the right hand side of above equation we have $\theta_r^\infty(z_i) - \theta_{\frac{1}{2}}^\infty(z_i) = 0$. Hence $\theta_r^\infty(z_i)$ is constant in r. Again from (2) we have:

$$\lim_{\lambda_l \to 0} \int_{A_{(\sigma,\rho)}(z_i)} |\iota_{\partial r_{z_i}} F_{A_{\lambda_l}}|^2(x) dV_{\lambda_l^{-2} g}(x) = 0 \text{ for any } \sigma,\ \rho$$

To see that this implies η is a cone measure at z_i, we apply (8) for any spherical function ϕ and any σ, ρ to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho^{4-n}\eta(\phi) - \sigma^{4-n}(\eta(\phi)) \\
&= \lim_{\lambda_l \to 0} \int_{A_{(\sigma,\rho)}(z_i)} 4|x - z_i|^{4-n} \phi |\iota_{\partial r_{z_i}} F_{A_{\lambda_l}}|^2 dV_{\lambda_l^{-2} g} \\
&- \lim_{\lambda_l \to 0} \int_\sigma^\rho 4\tau^{3-n} \Big(\int_{B_\tau(z_i)} |x - z_i| \langle \iota_{\partial r_{z_i}} F_{A_{\lambda_l}}, \iota_{\nabla\phi} F_{A_{\lambda_l}} \rangle dV_{\lambda_l^{-2} g} \Big) d\tau \\
&= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

since ϕ is arbitrary we know that $d\eta = r_i^{n-5} dr_i \wedge d\xi(\theta)$ where $r_i(\cdot) = dist(z_i, \cdot)$. Therefore we've found $k+1$ points $0, z_1, \cdots, z_k$ which span a k-plane V, such that η is cone measure w.r.t. each of those points. Hence η is independent of k variables. This completes the proof of the other direction. Hence we proved Proposition 1.3.4. $\diamondsuit$

1.4 Main Results

Let K_M be the smallest number such that

$$|sec_{B(p,16)}| \leq K_M$$

$$inj_{B(p,16)} \geq K_M^{-1}$$

Now we are ready to state the main results of the paper:

Theorem 1.4.1. *Let A be a stationary Yang-Mills connection satisfying $\int_{B(p,16)} |F_A|^2 dV_g \leq \Lambda$, then for each k and ϵ there is constant $C(n, \epsilon, \Lambda, K_M)$ such that for any $r > 0$ we have:*

$$Vol(B_r(S^k_{\epsilon,r}(A)) \cap B(p,1)) \leq C(n, \epsilon, \Lambda, K_M) r^{n-k} \tag{9}$$

Theorem 1.4.2. *Let A be a stationary Yang-Mills connection satisfying $\int_{B(p,16)} |F_A|^2 dV_g \leq \Lambda$, then for each k and ϵ there is constant $C(n, \epsilon, \Lambda, K_M)$ such that for any $r > 0$ we have:*

$$Vol(B_r(S^k_{\epsilon}(A)) \cap B(p,1)) \leq C(n, \epsilon, \Lambda, K_M) r^{n-k} \tag{10}$$

In particular we have the k-dimensional Hausdorff measure estimate $H^k(S^k_\epsilon(A)) \leq C(n, \epsilon, \Lambda)$. Furthermore, $S^k_\epsilon(A)$ is k-rectifiable.

Theorem 1.4.3. *Let A be a stationary Yang-Mills connection satisfying $\int_{B(p,16)} |F_A|^2 dV_g \leq \Lambda$, then $S^k(A)$ is k-rectifiable for each k.*

The next result concerns with the limit of a sequence of stationary admissible connections. Following [G. Tian], given a sequence of stationary admissible connections $\{A_i\}_i$ with $\|F_{A_i}\|_{L^2(B(p,16))} \leq \Lambda$, then up to passing to a subsequence we could let $\mu = |F_{A_\infty}|^2 dV_g + \nu$ be the $*$-weak limit of $|F_{A_i}|^2 dV_g$, where A_i converges up to gauge to A_∞ smoothly outside a singular set with codimension 4, and ν is a positive Radon measure whose support is $n-4$-rectifiable. In this case we say that A_i weakly converge to (A_∞, μ). The quantitative stratification for μ basically follows from the Theorems above and a limit argument (see proof of Theorem 1.4.6). In addition, we are also intereted in studying the stratification of A_∞ alone. Since A_∞ may not be stationary, we won't expect a similar stratification result in terms of tangent measure. Nevertheless we could consider a slightly weaker stratification, which is a benefit from being the weak limit of a sequence of stationary connections. So let's first introduce the notion of "tangent connection" of an admissible connection, which is a weaker type of tangent cone compared with tangent measure:

Definition 1.4.4 (Tangent Connection)**.** *Let A be an admissible conneciton. A_y is called a tangent connection of A at y, if there is a sequence $\lambda_i \to 0$ such that A_{λ_i} weakly converge to (A_y, μ).*

A variant of the argument in Lemma 5.3.1 [G. Tian] shows that any tangent connection of A_∞ is 0-symmetric and thus equals the pull back of a connection from the unit sphere S^{n-1} up to gauge transform. Hence every tangent connection is a cone connection. Now we define the following stratification for A_∞:

Definition 1.4.5. *Given the connection A_∞ obtained as above, for each k the k^{th} weak-stratum $\mathcal{WS}^k(A_\infty)$ is defined to be*

$$\mathcal{WS}^k(A_\infty) := \left\{ y \in B(p,1) : \textit{no tangent connection of } A_\infty \textit{ at } y \textit{ is } k+1\textit{-symmetric} \right\} \tag{11}$$

Theorem 1.4.6. *Let $\{A_i\}$ be sequence of admissible stationary connections with $\|F_{A_i}\|_{L^2(B(p,16))} \leq \Lambda$, such that A_i weakly converge to (A_∞, μ). Then for each k and ϵ there is constant $C(n, \epsilon, \Lambda, K_M)$ such that for any $r > 0$ we have $S^k_{\epsilon,r}(A_\infty) \subset S^k_{\epsilon,r}(\mu)$ and it holds:*

$$Vol(B_r(S^k_{\epsilon,r}(\mu)) \cap B(p,1)) \leq C(n, \epsilon, \Lambda, K_M) r^{n-k} \tag{12}$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{WS}^k(A_\infty) \subset S^k(\mu)$ are both k-rectifiable.

Remark 1.4.7. *It should be noted that once Theorem 1.4.1 is done, Theorem 1.4.2 will be proved in almost the same manner, and then Theorem 1.4.3 follows trivially, while Theorem 1.4.6 is almost a corollary which only requires a little extra effort. Hence, proving Theorem 1.4.1 will be the main task of this paper.*

Now we shall outline the proof Theorem 1.4.1. We first remark that even if the structure of the proof resembles the work [A. Naber, D. Valtorta], there are significant differences. Indeed, one critical and essential distinction is that the quantitative symmetry in this paper (see definition 1.2.4) appears stronger than theirs (see definition 1.1 in [A. Naber, D. Valtorta]), which leads to various different arguments and subtleties; especially, it makes obtaining and applying the "L^2-Approximation Theorem" more challenging (See Section 4).

The task is to estimate the Minkowski Volume of $S^k_{\epsilon,r}$, the set of points x where there is no scale s larger than r such that $B(x,s)$ is $(k+1,\epsilon)$-symmetric. To begin with, let's take a first glance at the L^2-flatness function $D^k_\mu(x,r)$ defined as:

$$D^k_\mu(x,r) = \inf_{L^k \subset \mathbb{R}^n} r^{-(k+2)} \int_{B(x,r)} d^2(y, L^k) d\mu(y)$$

later in the proofs μ is usually taken to be a Dirac measure $\sum_i r_i^k \delta_{x_i}$ where $\{B(x_i, r_i)\}_i$ forms a cover of a subset of $S^k_{\epsilon,r}$, and the problem is frequently reduced to estimating such measure μ, which will be done by using an upward induction on scales. Usually by construction the first scale is trivial; so let's assume on all scales s below some $2^{-\alpha_0 - 1}$ we have the measure bound:

$$\mu(B(x,s)) \leq D(n) s^k$$

We then need to estimate the measure on the scale $2^{-\alpha_0}$. On the one hand, the Discrete-Rectifiable Reifenberg Theorem (see Theorem 2.0.4) states that for some fixed scale r_0 given that:

$$r^{-k}\sum_{2^{-\alpha}\leq 2r}\int_{B(x,r)}D^k_\mu(y,2^{-\alpha})d\mu(y)\leq\delta^2,\ \forall r\leq r_0$$

for some $\delta\equiv\delta(n)$, then μ is bounded on at the scale r_0:

$$\mu(B(x,r_0))\leq D(n)r_0^k,\ \forall x$$

On the other hand the L^2-Approximation Theorem makes rigorous the intuition that (at a certain scale) all almost-cone tips in $S^k_{\epsilon,r}$ should lie close to some k-plane; more precisely we prove in Section 3 that:

$$D^k_\mu(x,r)\lesssim r^{-k}\bigg(\int_{B(x,r)}W_r d\mu+\text{summable error}\bigg)$$

where W_r is the energy decay function defined by $W_r(x)=|\theta_{8r}(x)-\theta_{\epsilon_1 r}(x)|$, where $\epsilon_1\equiv\epsilon_1(n,\epsilon,\Lambda)$ is a small number that will be determined in the proof eventually. This function characterizes how close a point is to being a cone tip. Now comes the key observasion that the right hand side of above inequality is summable. Indeed we have for all $2^{-\alpha}\leq 2^{-\alpha_0}$ that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&2^{\alpha k}\sum_{s\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}}\int_{B(x,2^{-\alpha})}D^k_\mu(y,2^{-\beta})d\mu(y)\\
\leq&C2^{\alpha k}\sum_{s\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}}\int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})}\bigg(W_{2^{-\beta}}(z)+(\text{summable error})_{2^{-\beta}}\bigg)d\mu(z)\\
\leq&C'2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})}\bigg(|\theta_{2^{-\alpha+3}}(z)-\theta_{\epsilon_1 s}(z)|+\sum_{s\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}}(\text{summable error})_{2^{-\beta}}\bigg)d\mu(z)\\
=&C'2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})}\bigg(|\theta_{2^{-\alpha+3}}(z)-\theta_{\epsilon_1 s}(z)|+\text{error}\bigg)d\mu(z)
\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

note that in the later proofs s will be chosen so small that $D^k_\mu(y,2^{-\beta})\equiv 0$ for all $2^{-\beta}<s$. Then from the inductive assumption on scales below $2^{-\alpha_0-1}$ and a covering argument we should have a coarse bound on all $\mu(B(x,2^{-\alpha+3}))$ by $C''2^{-\alpha k}$. Insert this into the last line, we could bound it by:

$$C(n,\epsilon,\Lambda)\sup_{z\in\text{supp}(\mu)}(|\theta_{2^{-\alpha_0+3}}(z)-\theta_{\epsilon_1 s}(z)|+\text{error})$$

Given a small enough error, and that at each point in $\text{supp}(\mu)$ the energy pinch $|\theta_{2^{-\alpha_0+3}}(z)-\theta_{\epsilon_1 s}(z)|$ is sufficiently small, we could make the right hand side less than $\delta(n)^2$, and hence by the Discrete-Rectifiable Reifenberg Theorem we obtain the measure bound on scale $2^{-\alpha_0}$:

$$\mu(B(x,2^{-\alpha_0}))\leq D(n)2^{-\alpha_0 k}$$

in this way we complete the inductive estimate on μ, provided certain conditions such as the small energy pinch at centers of the cover are satisfied. To fulfill these conditions we will need inductive covering arguments, as been done in Section 4 and 5.

1.5 Acknowledgements

My deepest gratitude goes to Prof. Aaron Naber my advisor, for interesting me in the problem at first, and later devoting time and energy into our precious conversations, clearing my doubts, offering me invaluable help in the entire process and giving me tremendous encouragements.

2 Rectifiable-Reifenberg Theorem

One of the key ingredients in the proof of theorems 1.4.1, 1.4.2, 1.4.3 is the following Rectifiable-Reifenberg theorem, an original and difficult work established in [A. Naber, D. Valtorta].

Definition 2.0.1 (k-dimensional L^2-Flatness at scale r)**.** *Let μ be a measure in B_2 with $r > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We define:*

$$D^k_\mu(x,r) = \inf_{L^k \subset \mathbb{R}^n} r^{-(k+2)} \int_{B(x,r)} d^2(y, L^k) d\mu(y)$$

when $\mu(B(x,r)) \geq \epsilon_n r^k$ and $D^k_\mu(x,r) \equiv 0$ otherwise.

Remark 2.0.2. *In literature D^k_μ is usually refered to as Jone's number β_2.*

Theorem 2.0.3 (Rectifiable-Reifenberg)**.** *Let $S \subset B_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a H^k-measurable set. Set $\mu_S := H^k|_S$. If for $\forall \epsilon$, $\exists \delta(n,\epsilon)$, such that for all $B(x,r) \subset B_2$ with $H^k(S \cap B(x,r)) \geq \epsilon_n r^k$ it holds*

$$\int_{S \cap B(x,r)} \left(\int_0^r D^k_{\mu_S}(y,s) \frac{ds}{s} \right) dH^k(y) \leq \delta^2 r^k \tag{14}$$

then the following hold:

1) *for any $B(x,r) \subset B_1$ with $x \in S$, $H^k(S \cap B(x,r)) \leq (1+\epsilon)\omega_k r^k$*

2) *$S \cap B_1$ is k-rectifiable.*

Theorem 2.0.4 (Discrete Rectifiable-Reifenberg)**.** *Let $\{B(x_j, r_j)\}_{x_j \in S}$ be a collection of disjoint balls and let $\mu = \sum_j r_j^k \delta_{x_j}$ be the associated measure. Then there exists $\delta(n)$ and $D(n)$, such that if for all $B(x,r) \subset B_2$ with $\mu(B(x,r)) \geq \epsilon_n r^k$ it holds*

$$\sum_{2^{-\alpha} \leq 2r} \int_{B(x,r)} D^k_\mu(y, 2^{-\alpha}) d\mu(y) \leq \delta^2 r^k \tag{15}$$

Then we have the estimate

$$\sum_j r_j^k \leq D(n)$$

3 L^2-Approximation Theorem

3.1 Energy Decay Function

For $x \in S^k_{\epsilon,r}$ we introduce its associated energy decay function $W_r(x) \equiv W_{r,\epsilon}(x)$ as follows:

$$W_r(x) := \theta_{8r}(x) - \theta_{\epsilon_1 r}(x)$$

where $\epsilon_1 \equiv \epsilon_1(n, \epsilon, \Lambda)$ will be determined in the proof of the main theorem in the next section.

3.2 L^2-Approximation Theorem

Theorem 3.2.1 (L^2-Approximation Theorem)**.** *Let A be a stationary Yang-Mills connection with*

$$\|F_A\|_{L^2(B(p,16r))} \leq \Lambda$$

Then, for all ϵ, there exists constants $\delta \equiv \delta(n, \epsilon, \Lambda)$ and $C(n, \epsilon, \Lambda)$, if $K_M \leq \delta(n, \epsilon, \Lambda)$, and A is $(0, \delta)$-symmetric in $B(p, 8r)$ but not $(k+1, \epsilon)$-symmetric in $B(p, r)$, then for all finite measure μ in $B(p, r)$ it holds:

$$\begin{aligned} D^k_\mu(p, r) &= r^{-2-k} \inf_{L^k} \int_{B(p,r)} d^2(x, L^k) d\mu(x) \\ &\leq C(n, \epsilon, \Lambda) r^{-k} \int_{B(p,r)} \left(W_r(x) + r^{2-n} \int_{B(x,\epsilon_1 r)} |\iota_{x-z} F_A|^2(z) dV_g(z) \right) d\mu(x) \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where the infimum is taken over all k-dimensional affine planes.

3.3 Energy Lower bound

Lemma 3.3.1. *Let all conditions be the same as in Theorem 3.2.1; then for all ϵ, there exists $\delta \equiv \delta(n, \epsilon, \Lambda)$ such that if $K_M \leq \delta(n, \epsilon, \Lambda)$, and moreover A is $(0, \delta)$-symmetric in $B(p, 8r)$ but not $(k+1, \epsilon)$-symmetric in $B(p, r)$, then for any $k+1$ dimensional subspace V through p spanned by orthonormal basis $\nu_1, \cdots, \nu_{k+1}$:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \int_{B(p,4r)} |\iota_{\nu_i} F_A|^2(x) dV_g(x) \geq r^{n-4} \delta$$

Proof. Since the conclusion is scaling invariant, for convinience we will simply take $r = 1$ and let $p = 0^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Choose $\delta \equiv \delta(n, \epsilon, \Lambda)$ to be specified later. We are going to show that if A is $(0, \delta)$-symmetric in $B(0, 8)$ and for some $k+1$ subspace through p spanned by $\partial z_1, \cdots, \partial z_{k+1}$ the following holds:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \int_{B(0,4)} |\iota_{\partial_{z_i}} F_A|^2(x) dV_g(x) < \delta \tag{17}$$

then A is $(k+1, \epsilon)$-symmetric in $B(0, 1)$, which gives a contradiction. This proves that such δ will suffice to conclude lemma 3.3.1.

Let $\xi(x)$ be a smooth function that equals to 1 on $B(0,1)$ and equals to 0 outside $B(0,1+a)$, where $a \equiv a(n,\epsilon,\Lambda)$ will be determined later. Note that it is possible to make $|\nabla\xi| \leq 2a^{-1}$. Let's fix any $i_0 = 1, \cdots, k+1$. Also, we denote by e_{i_0} a point on the $i_0{}^{th}$ axis with $|\overrightarrow{e_{i_0}0}| = 1$. For all $s \leq 2$ and $\tau \in [0,1]$, set:

$$X_{\tau,s}(x) := \xi(\frac{x+\tau e_{i_0}}{s})\partial z_{i_0}$$

Obviously for the prescribed s and τ, the above vector field is smooth and compactly supported in $B(0,16)$. Hence by inserting $X_{\tau,s}$ into the stationary equation (1), we obtain:

$$\int_{B(0,16)} \Big(|F_A|^2 div X_{\tau,s} - 4\sum_{l,j=1}^{n} \langle F_A(\nabla_{\partial z_l} X_{\tau,s}, \partial z_j), F_A(\partial z_l, \partial z_j)\rangle \Big) dV_g = 0 \tag{18}$$

where $\partial z_1, \cdots, \partial z_n$ forms orthonormal basis on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} div X_{\tau,s} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{i_0}}[\xi(\frac{x+\tau e_{i_0}}{s})] \\ &= \frac{d}{d\tau}[\xi(\frac{x+\tau e_{i_0}}{s})] \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\partial z_l} X_{\tau,s} &= \nabla_{\partial z_l}[\xi(\frac{x+\tau e_{i_0}}{s})\partial z_{i_0}] \\ &= s^{-1}\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial z_l}(\frac{x+\tau e_{i_0}}{s})\partial z_{i_0} \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Insert (19) and (20) into (18):

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{d\tau}\Big(\int_{B(-\tau e_{i_0},(1+a)s)} |F_A|^2 \xi(\frac{x+\tau e_{i_0}}{s}) dV_g \Big) \\ &= 4\sum_{l,j=1}^{n} \int_{B(-\tau e_{i_0},(1+a)s)} s^{-1}\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial z_l}\langle F_A(\partial z_{i_0}, \partial z_j), F_A(\partial z_l, \partial z_j)\rangle dV_g \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Furthermore, using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big| \frac{d}{d\tau}\Big(\int_{B(-\tau e_{i_0},(1+a)s)} |F_A|^2 \xi(\frac{x+\tau e_{i_0}}{s}) dV_g \Big) \Big| \\ &\leq C(sa)^{-1}\Big(\int_{B(-\tau e_{i_0},(1+a)s)} |\iota_{\partial z_{i_0}} F_A|^2 dV_g \Big)^{1/2} \Big(\int_{B(-\tau e_{i_0},(1+a)s)} |F_A|^2 dV_g \Big)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C(sa)^{-1}\sqrt{\Lambda}(\int_{B(0,4)} |\iota_{\partial z_{i_0}} F_A|^2 dV_g)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C(sa)^{-1}\sqrt{\Lambda\delta} \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Now take s to be 2 and $\frac{\epsilon}{1+a}$ respectively, and integrate above w.r.t. $d\tau$ from 0 to $\frac{1}{2}$, using fundamental theorem of calculus we have:

$$\Big| 2^{4-n}\int_{B(-\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0},2(1+a))} |F_A|^2 \xi(\frac{x+\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0}}{2}) dV_g - 2^{4-n}\int_{B(0,2(1+a))} |F_A|^2 \xi(\frac{x}{2}) dV_g \Big| \leq C(n,\Lambda)a^{-1}\sqrt{\delta} \tag{23}$$

$$\left|\epsilon^{4-n}\int_{B(-\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0},\epsilon)}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{1+a}{\epsilon}(x+\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0}))dV_g-\epsilon^{4-n}\int_{B(0,\epsilon)}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{1+a}{\epsilon}x)dV_g\right|\leq C(n,\epsilon,\Lambda)a^{-1}\sqrt{\delta} \quad (24)$$

On the other hand by choosing $\delta\leq\frac{\epsilon}{100}$ and using the property of ξ we have:

$$(2(1+a))^{4-n}\int_{B(0,2(1+a))}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{x}{2})dV_g\leq 8^{4-n}\int_{B(0,8)}|F_A|^2dV_g$$

$$(\frac{\epsilon}{1+a})^{4-n}\int_{B(0,\epsilon)}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{1+a}{\epsilon}x)dV_g\geq(8\delta)^{4-n}\int_{B(0,8\delta)}|F_A|^2dV_g$$

$$2^{4-n}\int_{B(-\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0},2(1+a))}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{x+\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0}}{2})dV_g\geq 2^{4-n}\int_{B(-\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0},2)}|F_A|^2dV_g$$

$$\epsilon^{4-n}\int_{B(-\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0},\epsilon)}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{1+a}{\epsilon}(x+\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0}))dV_g\leq\epsilon^{4-n}\int_{B(-\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0},\epsilon)}|F_A|^2dV_g$$

moreover the $(0,\delta)$ symmetry of $B(0,8)$ would imply:

$$8^{4-n}\int_{B(0,8)}|F_A|^2dV_g-(8\delta)^{4-n}\int_{B(0,8\delta)}|F_A|^2dV_g\leq\delta$$

Using triangle inequality we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&2^{4-n}\int_{B(-\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0},2)}|F_A|^2dV_g-\epsilon^{4-n}\int_{B(-\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0},\epsilon)}|F_A|^2dV_g\\
\leq&2^{4-n}\int_{B(-\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0},2(1+a))}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{x+\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0}}{2})dV_g-\epsilon^{4-n}\int_{B(-\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0},\epsilon)}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{1+a}{\epsilon}(x+\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0}))dV_g\\
\leq&\left|2^{4-n}\int_{B(-\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0},2(1+a))}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{x+\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0}}{2})dV_g-2^{4-n}\int_{B(0,2(1+a))}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{x}{2})dV_g\right| \qquad (25)\\
+&\left|\epsilon^{4-n}\int_{B(-\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0},\epsilon)}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{1+a}{\epsilon}(x+\frac{1}{2}e_{i_0}))dV_g-\epsilon^{4-n}\int_{B(0,\epsilon)}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{1+a}{\epsilon}x)dV_g\right|\\
+&\left|2^{4-n}\int_{B(0,2(1+a))}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{x}{2})dV_g-\epsilon^{4-n}\int_{B(0,\epsilon)}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{1+a}{\epsilon}x)dV_g\right|\\
=&I+II+III
\end{aligned}$$

From (23) and (24) we have:

$$I+II\leq C'(n,\epsilon,\Lambda)a^{-1}\sqrt{\delta}$$

We further use triangle inequality to estimate term III:

$$\begin{aligned}
III\leq&\left|2^{4-n}\int_{B(0,2(1+a))}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{x}{2})dV_g-(2(1+a))^{4-n}\int_{B(0,2(1+a))}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{x}{2})dV_g\right|\\
&+\left|(2(1+a))^{4-n}\int_{B(0,2(1+a))}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{x}{2})dV_g-(\frac{\epsilon}{1+a})^{4-n}\int_{B(0,\epsilon)}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{1+a}{\epsilon}x)dV_g\right| \qquad (26)\\
&+\left|(\frac{\epsilon}{1+a})^{4-n}\int_{B(0,\epsilon)}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{1+a}{\epsilon}x)dV_g-\epsilon^{4-n}\int_{B(0,\epsilon)}|F_A|^2\xi(\frac{1+a}{\epsilon}x)dV_g\right|\\
&=IV+V+VI
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly,

$$IV + VI \leq C(n)\Lambda\bigg(|(1+a)^{n-4} - 1| + |(1+a)^{4-n} - 1|\bigg)$$

while:

$$V \leq 8^{4-n}\int_{B(0,8)} |F_A|^2 dV_g - (8\delta)^{4-n}\int_{B(0,8\delta)} |F_A|^2 dV_g \leq \delta$$

Let's firstly choose $a(n, \epsilon, \Lambda)$ so small that $IV + VI \leq \epsilon/3$, and then choose $\delta(n, \epsilon, \Lambda, a)$ to be sufficiently small such that $I + II + V \leq \epsilon/3$; this makes the left hand side of inequality (25) less than ϵ. Now that i_0 is arbitrarily chosen from $1, \cdots, k+1$, we hence found $(\epsilon, 1)$-cone tips $-\frac{1}{2}e_1, \cdots, -\frac{1}{2}e_{k+1}, 0$ such that they $\frac{1}{2}$-effectively (and hence $\tau(n)$-effectively) span a $k+1$-plane w.r.t. $B(0,1)$. By definition $B(0,1)$ is $(k+1, \epsilon)$-symmetric. This completes the proof of lemma 3.3.1. ♢

3.4 Proof of Theorem 3.2.1

Proof of Theorem 3.2.1. Again due to scale invariance we may assume that $r = 1$. Up to normalization we may assume that μ is a probability measure on $B(p, 1)$. Consider the following linear transform on $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$T : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$$
$$v \mapsto \int_{B(p,1)} \langle x, v\rangle x d\mu(x)$$

Clearly this is a symmetric linear transform and hence is diagonalizable. Let its (ordered) eigenvalues be $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n$, and the corresponding eigenvectors be $\nu_1, \nu_2, \cdots, \nu_n$. Using Lagrange multiplier method one could show that:

$$\inf_{L^l} \int_{B(p,1)} d^2(x, L^l) d\mu(x) = \lambda_{l+1} + \cdots + \lambda_n \leq (n-l)\lambda_{l+1} \tag{27}$$

for any $l = 1, 2, \cdots, n-1$. Hence to obtain the inequality (16) we only need to estimate λ_{k+1}. For convinience we may assume from now on that $p = 0$ and the center of μ-mass is 0, i.e. $\int_{B(0,1)} x d\mu(x) = 0$. Note that for any j we have:

$$\lambda_j \nu_j = \langle T\nu_j, \nu_j\rangle = \int_{B(0,1)} \langle x, \nu_j\rangle x d\mu(x)$$

Hence for all $z \in B(0, 4)$ we are able to write:

$$\lambda_j \nu_j = \langle T\nu_j, \nu_j\rangle = \int_{B(0,1)} \langle x, \nu_j\rangle (x - z) d\mu(x)$$

from this we immediately obtain that:

$$\lambda_j \iota_{\nu_j} F_A(z) = \int_{B(0,1)} \langle x, \nu_j\rangle \iota_{x-z} F_A(z) d\mu(x)$$

further use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we obtain:

$$\lambda_j^2 |\iota_{\nu_j} F_A(z)|^2 \leq \lambda_j \int_{B(0,1)} |\iota_{x-z} F_A(z)|^2 d\mu(x)$$

Now we could integrate above identity w.r.t. the volume form on $B(0,4)$ to see:

$$\lambda_j \int_{B(0,4)} |\iota_{\nu_j} F_A|^2(z) dV_g(z) \leq \int_{B(1,0)} \int_{B(0,4)} |\iota_{x-z} F_A(z)|^2 dV_g(z) d\mu(x)$$

For each fixed $x \in B(0,1)$, denote $\frac{x-z}{|x-z|}$ as ∂_{r_x}; we then compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B(0,4)} |\iota_{x-z} F_A(z)|^2 dV_g(z) \\
\leq &\int_{B(x,8)} |\iota_{x-z} F_A(z)|^2 dV_g(z) \\
\leq &\int_{A_{(\epsilon_1,8)}(x)} |\iota_{\partial_{r_x}} F_A(z)|^2 |x-z|^{4-n} |x-z|^{n-2} dV_g(z) + \int_{B(x,\epsilon_1)} |\iota_{x-z} F_A(z)|^2 dV_g(z) \\
= &C(n) \Big(W_1(x) + \int_{B(x,\epsilon_1)} |\iota_{x-z} F_A(z)|^2 dV_g(z) \Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

in both the second last inequality and the last identity we have used (2).

By (28) we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{k+1} \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \int_{B(0,4)} |\iota_{\nu_j} F_A(z)|^2 dV_g(z) \leq &\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \lambda_j \int_{B(0,4)} |\iota_{\nu_j} F_A(z)|^2 dV_g(z) \\
&\leq C''(n) \int_{B(0,1)} \Big(W_1(x) + \int_{B(x,\epsilon_1)} |\iota_{x-z} F_A(z)|^2 dV_g(z) \Big) d\mu(x)
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

By lemma 3.3.1 we see that there exists $\delta = \delta(n, \epsilon, \Lambda)$ such that if A is $(0,\delta)$-symmetric in $B(p,8)$ but not $(k+1,\epsilon)$-symmetric in $B(p,1)$, we must have that:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \int_{B(0,4)} |\iota_{\nu_j} F_A(z)|^2 dV_g(z) \geq \delta$$

Now insert this into (29), and combine with (27), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{L^k} \int_{B(0,1)} d^2(x, L^k) d\mu(x) \\
\leq &\, c(n) \lambda_{k+1} \\
\leq &\frac{c(n) C''(n)}{\delta(n,\epsilon,\Lambda)} \int_{B(0,1)} \Big(W_1(x) + \int_{B(x,\epsilon_1)} |\iota_{x-z} F_A(z)|^2 dV_g(z) \Big) d\mu(x) \\
= &C(n,\epsilon,\Lambda) \int_{B(0,1)} \Big(W_1(x) + \int_{B(x,\epsilon_1)} |\iota_{x-z} F_A(z)|^2 dV_g(z) \Big) d\mu(x)
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Hence we are done with the proof of Theorem 3.2.1. ♢

4 An Inductive Covering Lemma

Now we prove a key covering lemma by induction on the scales. After this is proved, we are almost done, since to complete the whole proof the rest work is simply an application of this lemma finitely many times.

4.1 Energy Scale

Let $E = \sup_{x\in B(p,1)} \theta_1(x)$. For fixed ϵ, let

$$\delta = \frac{\delta_0}{100} \tag{31}$$

where $\delta_0 = \min\{\epsilon_1(n,\epsilon,\Lambda), \delta(n,\epsilon,\Lambda)\}$, both numbers are chosen as in Theorem 3.2.1. All δ that appears in rest of the paper will refer to the one in (31). Also, all $\delta(n)$ throughout the rest of the paper refers to the one in Theorem 2.0.4. Let $\eta \equiv \eta(n,\epsilon,\Lambda) < \delta$ be a small constant that only depends on n, ϵ, Λ and will be specified by the end of this section. Now define the energy scale for any $x \in B(p,1)$ by

$$s_x = s_x^{E,\eta} \equiv \inf\left\{r \le s \le 1 : \sup_{B(x,2s)\cap B(p,1)} \theta_{\delta s}(y) \ge E - \eta\right\} \tag{32}$$

provided the set on the right hand side is non-empty.

Now we need the following covering lemma, which is the main goal of this section.

4.2 Key Lemma

Key Lemma 4.2.1. *Assume that*

$$\sup_{B(p,1)} \theta_\delta(y) \ge E - \eta \tag{33}$$

then we have $S^k_{\epsilon,r} \cap B(p,1) \subset U_{good}(r) \cup U_{bad}(r)$, such that the following are satisfied:

1) *for $r > 0$, $U_{good}(r) := \bigcup_{i=1}^N B(x_i, r)$ and $N \le C(n) r^{-k}$*

2) *for $r = 0$, $U_{good}(0)$ is k-rectifiable and $Vol(B_s(U_{good}(0))) \le C(n)s^k$ for all $s > 0$; especially, $H^k(U_{good}(0)) \le C(n)$.*

3) *for $r \ge 0$, $U_{bad}(r) := \bigcup_{j=1}^M B(y_j, r_j)$, with $\delta r \le r_j \le \delta$ and $\sum_{i=1}^M r_j^k \le C(n,\Lambda,\epsilon,\eta)$*

4) $\sup_{y\in B(y_j,r_j)} \theta_{r_j}(y) \le E - \eta$

Proof of Key Lemma 4.2.1. We will simply denote $U_{good}(r)$ and $U_{bad}(r)$ by U_{good} and U_{bad} if there is no ambiguity. Due to (33), the set in (32) is nonempty, and hence $S^k_{\epsilon,r} \cap B(p,1)$ is decomposed into a "good" set and a "bad" set with respect to its energy scale function as follows:

1) $V_{good} = \left\{x \in S^k_{\epsilon,r} \cap B(p,1) : s_x = r\right\}$

2) $V_{bad} = \left\{x \in S^k_{\epsilon,r} \cap B(p,1) : 1 \ge s_x > r\right\}$

Furthermore, for $r > 0$, one could choose a Vitali cover of both sets, such that

$$V_{good} \subset \bigcup_i B(x_i, r), \text{ where } B(x_i, r/5) \text{ are disjoint, with } x_i \in V_{good} \tag{34}$$

similarly, for $r \ge 0$,

$$V_{bad} \subset \bigcup_i B(y_i, s_i), \text{ where } B(z_i, s_i/5) \text{ are disjoint, with } z_i \in V_{bad} \text{ and } s_i = s_{x_i} > r \tag{35}$$

for each $B(z_i, s_i)$ in the above cover of V_{bad}, further choose a Vitali cover by $\cup_l^{N_i} B(z_{i,l}, \delta s_i)$. It is clear that $N_i \leq N(\delta, n)$ due to volume relation. Denote

$$U_{good}(r) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} B(x_i, r) \text{ for } r > 0$$

$$U_{good}(0) = V_{good}(0)$$

$$U_{bad} = \bigcup_i \bigcup_l^{N_i} B(z_{i,l}, \delta s_i) := \bigcup_{j=1}^{M} B(y_j, r_j) \text{ for } r \geq 0$$

clearly, $\delta r \leq r_j \leq \delta$; moreover it is obvious that item 4) in lemma 4.2.1 is satisfied. Therefore to conclude lemma 4.2.1 it only suffices to give estimate of the volume of U_{good} and U_{bad}.

4.3 Estimates of U_{good} for $r > 0$

The idea is to slightly alter the original cover so that the new centers are "almost-cone tips" in the sense that the energy pinches at these centers are small; then we could apply theorems in preceding sections to the Dirac measure supported at the new centers, which yields the volume control provided the energy pinches, i.e. η, are chosen to be small enough.

By the definition of U_{good}, for each x_i, there is a point $z_i \in B(x_i, 2r)$ such that $\theta_{\delta r}(z_i) > E - \eta$. Clearly, $\bigcup_i B(x_i, r) \subset \bigcup_i B(z_i, 4r)$. Now let $\left\{B(z_i, 4r)\right\}_{i=1}^{N'}$ be a maximal disjoint collection. By a standard ball-counting argument we have $N \lesssim_n N'$, and therefore to estimate U_{good} it is enough to estimate N'. Indeed by the fact that $\left\{B(x_i, r/5)\right\}_{i=1}^{N}$ are disjoint and $\left\{B(z_i, 8r)\right\}_{i=1}^{N'}$ covers $\left\{B(x_i, r)\right\}_{i=1}^{N}$, we have the following volume relation:

$$N \cdot \omega_n (\frac{r}{5})^n \leq N' \cdot \omega_n (8r)^n$$

which gives us the desired estimate $N \leq 40^n N'$. Now consider the measure given by $\mu = \sum r^n \delta_{z_i}$. Fix any $x \in B(p, 1)$. We will prove by induction on α that

$$\mu(B(x, 2^{-\alpha})) \leq D(n) 2^{-\alpha k} \tag{36}$$

where $D(n)$ is the same as in Theorem 2.0.4. Once this is shown we are done. Indeed by choosing $x = p$ and $r = 1$, we have $N' r^k \leq D(n)$. This proves the claimed estimate.

Let us begin the induction with the case when $\alpha = \alpha_0$ such that $2r < 2^{-\alpha_0} \leq 4r$. By the maximality and the disjointness of $\left\{B(z_i, 8r)\right\}_{i=1}^{N'}$, clearly we have $\mu(B(x, 2^{-\alpha_0})) \leq r^k \leq 2^{-\alpha_0 k}$. Therefore we assume that claim (36) is proved for $2^{-(\alpha+1)}$, and then proceed to prove it for 2^{α}. Firstly we could easily obtain a rough estimate on the scale $2^{-\alpha}$ using the induction, by the simple observasion that for all $2^{-(\alpha+1)} \leq s \leq 2^{-(\alpha-2)}$, $B(x, s)$ is covered by at most $C(n)$ many balls $\{B(w_i, 2^{-(\alpha+1)})\}$ such that the concentric balls with one-fifth radii are disjoint, and therefore

$$\mu(B(x, s)) \leq \sum \mu(B(w_i, 2^{-(\alpha+1)}) \leq D(n) C(n) 2^{-(\alpha+1)k} \leq D'(n) s^k \tag{37}$$

where $D'(n) \gg D(n)$.

Next we are going to employ Theorem 2.0.4 in order to achieve the volume estimate. When $\mu(B(y, t)) \leq \epsilon_k t^k$, or $t \leq r$, by definition we have $D_\mu^k(y, t) \equiv 0$; hence we only need to consider the case when

$\mu(B(y,t)) > \epsilon_k t^k$ and $t > r$. In this case, there is at least one point y' inside $\mathrm{supp}\mu \cap B(y,t)$. From the construction of μ, $B(y',8t)$ is $(0,\delta)$-symmetric. Indeed,

$$|\theta_{\delta t}(y') - \theta_{16t}(y')| \leq |\theta_{\delta r}(y') - \theta_1(y')| \leq \eta < \delta$$

Combining this with the fact that $B(y',2t)$ is not $(k+1,\epsilon)$-symmetric, and by choosing η to be sufficiently small, we could apply Theorem 3.2.1 to see that:

$$\begin{aligned} D^k_\mu(y,t) &\leq C D^k_\mu(y',2t) \\ &\leq Ct^{-k}\int_{B(y',2t)}\left(W_t(z) + t^{2-n}\int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 t)}|\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2 dV_g(x)\right)d\mu(z) \\ &\leq Ct^{-k}\int_{B(y,3t)}\left(W_t(z) + t^{2-n}\int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 t)}|\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2 dV_g(x)\right)d\mu(z) \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Compute for all $r \leq t \leq 2^{-\alpha}$:

$$\begin{aligned} &2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-\alpha})} D^k_\mu(y,t)d\mu(y) \\ \leq\ & C2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-\alpha})} t^{-k}\int_{B(y,3t)}\left(W_t(z) + t^{2-n}\int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 t)}|\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2 dV_g(x)\right)d\mu(z)d\mu(y) \\ \leq\ & C2^{\alpha k}t^{-k}\int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})}\mu(B(z,3t))\left(W_t(z) + t^{2-n}\int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 t)}|\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2 dV_g(x)\right)d\mu(z) \\ \leq\ & C'2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})}\left(W_t(z) + t^{2-n}\int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 t)}|\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2 dV_g(x)\right)d\mu(z) \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where we interchanged the order of integral in the second line, and used the induction as well as the rough estimate (37) in the third line. Now sum up both sides of the above inequality over $t = 2^{-\beta}$ in between $[r, 2^{-\alpha}]$, and use the definition of $W_t(z)$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{r\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}} 2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-\alpha})} D^k_\mu(y,2^{-\beta})d\mu(y) \\ \leq\ & \sum_{r\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}} C'2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})}\left(W_{2^{-\beta}}(z) + (2^{-\beta})^{2-n}\int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta})}|\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2 dV_g(x)\right)d\mu(z) \\ \leq\ & C'2^{\alpha k}\Bigg(8\epsilon_1^{-1}\int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})}|\theta_{2^{-\alpha+3}}(z) - \theta_{\epsilon_1 r}(z)|d\mu(z) \\ &+ \int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})}\left(\sum_{r\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}}(2^{-\beta})^{2-n}\int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta})}|\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2 dV_g(x)\right)d\mu(z)\Bigg) \\ \leq\ & C''\epsilon_1^{-1}\eta + C'2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})}\left(\sum_{r\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}}(2^{-\beta})^{2-n}\int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta})}|\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2 dV_g(x)\right)d\mu(z) \\ =\ & C''\epsilon_1^{-1}\eta + II \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where in the first term of the last inequality we have once again used the rough estimate (37). Now let's turn to the estimate of the integrand inside $d\mu$ of the second term II; using a dyadic decomposition we

compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{r\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}} \left(2^{-\beta}\right)^{2-n} \int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta})} |\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2 dV_g(x) \\
&\leq \sum_{r\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}} \left(2^{-\beta}\right)^{2-n} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{A_{(\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k-1},\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k})}(z)} |\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2 dV_g(x) \\
&\leq C(n) \sum_{r\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(2^{-k}\epsilon_1\right)^{n-2} \int_{A_{(\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k-1},\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k})}(z)} |x-z|^{4-n} |\iota_{\partial_{r_z}} F_A|^2 dV_g(x) \\
&= C(n) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(2^{-k}\epsilon_1\right)^{n-2} \left(\sum_{r\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}} \int_{A_{(\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k-1},\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k})}(z)} |x-z|^{4-n} |\iota_{\partial_{r_z}} F_A|^2 dV_g(x) \right) \\
&= C(n) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(2^{-k}\epsilon_1\right)^{n-2} \left(\sum_{r\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}} \left(\theta_{\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k}}(z) - \theta_{\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k-1}}(z) \right) \right) \\
&\leq 2C(n)\Lambda \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(2^{-k}\epsilon_1\right)^{n-2} \\
&\leq C(n,\Lambda)\epsilon_1^{n-2}
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

note that in both the second equality and the second last inequality we have used the monotonicity formula (2). Now insert this to the term II of the last line of (40), and again use the rough estimate (37) we get:

$$\sum_{r\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}} 2^{\alpha k} \int_{B(x,2^{-\alpha})} D_\mu^k(y, 2^{-\beta}) d\mu(y) \leq C'' \epsilon_1^{-1}\eta + C(n,\epsilon,\Lambda)\epsilon_1^{n-2}$$

recall we let $\delta(n)$ be as in Theorem 2.0.4; by firstly choosing $\epsilon_1 \equiv \epsilon_1(n,\epsilon,\Lambda)$ to be sufficiently small such that the second term is less than $\delta(n)^2/2$, and then choosing η to be small enough such that the first term is also less than $\delta(n)^2/2$ we have:

$$\sum_{2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}} 2^{\alpha k} \int_{B(x,2^{-\alpha})} D_\mu^k(y, 2^{-\beta}) d\mu(y) = \sum_{r\leq 2^{-\beta}\leq 2^{-\alpha}} 2^{\alpha k} \int_{B(x,2^{-\alpha})} D_\mu^k(y, 2^{-\beta}) d\mu(y) \leq \delta(n)^2 \tag{42}$$

We now apply Theorem 2.0.4 to see that

$$\mu(B(x,2^{-\alpha})) \leq D(n) 2^{-\alpha k}$$

This finishes the induction and hence the estimate of U_{good} for $r > 0$, and hence item 1) in lemma 4.2.1 is proved.

Next we use this estimate to prove item 2).

4.4 Estimates of $U_{good}(0)$

Indeed, since for all $r > 0$ we have $U_{good}(0) \subset U_{good}(r)$, hence we have from item 1) that:

$$\mathrm{Vol}(B_s(U_{good}(0))) \leq \mathrm{Vol}(B_s(U_{good}(s))) \leq C(n,\Lambda,\epsilon)s^k$$

Especially this gives us the Hausdorff measure estimate $H^k(U_{good}(0)) \leq C(n, \epsilon, \Lambda)$. Now by applying the same argument on a rescaled ball $B(x, r)$ we obtained that

$$H^k(U_{good}(0) \cap B(x, r)) \leq C(n, \epsilon, \Lambda) r^k \tag{43}$$

Set $\mu = H^k|_{U_{good}(0)}$; then we could mimic the same process in (38) to (42), in order to achieve the condition in Theorem 2.0.3. Note that we need to use the (43) to achieve the same inequality as the last one in (40). Also this the δ that appears in (42) is the same as in Theorem 2.0.3. Now from Theorem 2.0.3, we are done with item 2).

4.5 Estimates of U_{bad}

Since

$$\sum_j {r_j}^k = \sum_i \sum_{l=1}^{N_i} (\delta s_i)^k \leq \delta^k N(n, \delta) \sum_i {s_i}^k$$

it will be enough to study the cover $\bigcup_i B(y_i, s_i)$ as in (35), and estimate $\sum_i {s_i}^k$ instead. Now for technical reason we need to introduce the following notions of R-relateness.

Definition 4.5.1. *For any large constant R, we say that $B(p_1, r_1)$ and $B(p_2, r_2)$ are R-relate, if $p_1 \in B(p_2, Rr_2)$ or $p_2 \in B(p_1, Rr_1)$, and it holds $R^{-2} r_2 \leq r_1 \leq R^2 r_2$.*

Remark 4.5.2. *Fix $B(p, r)$, let $V = \left\{B(p_j, r_j)\right\}_{j=1}^N$ be any collection of balls, such that*

1) *$B(p_j, r_j)$ is R-relate to $B(p, r)$*

2) *$r_j \geq r$*

3) *$\left\{B(p_j, \frac{r_j}{5})\right\}_{j=1}^N$ are disjoint.*

Then by standard ball counting argument, $N \leq N(n, R) - 1$.

With this definition we are now ready to introduce the following technical construction.

Lemma 4.5.3. *For fixed $R > 10$, let $N(n, R)$ be the same integer as in the above remark. Then the collection of balls given in (35) might be classified into at most $N(n, R)$ groups, denoted by $I_1, \cdots, I_{N(n,R)}$, such that none of two balls in the same group are R-relate. Indeed, given $B(y_i, s_i)$ and $B(y_j, s_j)$ both in I_a, with $y_i \in B(y_j, Rs_j)$, we have $s_i \leq R^{-2} s_j$.*

Proof of lemma 4.5.3. To prove the existence of the classification, we start with $N(n, R)$ empty sets, denoted by $I_1, \cdots, I_{N(n,R)}$. Now we inductively sort the balls from $\left\{B(y_i, s_i)\right\}_{i=1}^M$ into N groups by placing them into these empty sets one by one. We start off by putting a ball with maximal radius into I_1. This finishes the first stage of induction. Suppose we are done with the first l steps, and now proceed to complete the $(l+1)^{th}$ step and hence finishes the induction. Let $B(y_l, r_l)$ be the ball with the maximal radius among the balls that haven't yet been sorted into $I_1, \cdots, I_N$. Because the balls that were already selected have radii no less than that of $B(y_l, s_l)$, we then know from the remark above, that among those selected there are at most $N-1$ of them being R-relate to $B(y_l, s_l)$. As a matter of fact, there is a set I_{i_l} that doesn't contain any ball that is R-relate to $B(y_l, s_l)$. We then complete the $(l+1)^{th}$ step by placing

$B(y_l, s_l)$ into I_{i_l}. To prove the second claim, we only need to exclude the situation that $s_i \geq R^2 s_j$ when we have $y_i \in B(y_j, Rs_j)$. Indeed, these combining with the disjointness of $B(y_i, s_i)$ implies that

$$Rs_j \geq d(y_i, y_j) \geq s_i/5 + s_j/5 \geq (R^2+1)s_j/5$$

which is absurd when R is large enough. Hence we finish the proof of lemma 4.5.3. $\diamondsuit$

Hence, to complete the estimate of U_{bad} it suffices to give the volume estimate of balls in each I_a, because there is a definite number of I_a(this number $N(n, R)$ only depends on n and ϵ and is independent of r). Note that the number R that determines the classification will be chosen later. Let

$$I_a = \{B(y_i, s_i)_{i=1}^{N_a}\}$$

Set:

$$\mu^a = \sum_{B(y_i,s_i)\in I_a} s_i^k \delta_{y_i} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_a} s_i^k \delta_{y_i} \tag{44}$$

Our goal is to show

$$\mu^a(B(p,1)) \leq C(n)$$

most importantly, the bound on the right hand side doesn't depend on R. This allows the freedom to determine the number R in the future, which should only depend on n and ϵ.

4.6 Reduction to Estimates of I_a

Fix any point in $\mathrm{supp}(\mu^a)$ denoted by x_0. We will prove by induction that

$$\mu^a(B(x_0, 2^{-\alpha})) \leq C(n)2^{-k\alpha} \text{ where } C(n) = 20^{8n}D(n) \tag{45}$$

this is enough for our purpose, since setting $\alpha = -1$ we obtain the desired estimate

$$\mu^a(B(p,1)) \leq 2^k C(n)$$

The first stage of the induction is trivial due to the disjointness of $B(y_i, s_i/5)$. Now suppose we obtain the estimate (45) for all scales $\beta \geq \alpha + 1$:

$$\mu^a(B(x_0, 2^{-\beta})) \leq C(n)2^{-k\beta} \text{ where } C(n) = 20^{8n}D(n) \tag{46}$$

We will proceed to prove (45) for α.

Define:

$$J_\alpha = \left\{y_i : y_i \in B(x_0, 2^{-\alpha}) \cap \mathrm{supp}(\mu^a)\right\}$$

From now on, we use the notation μ^a to denote the restriction of the measure μ^a on the set J_α, since only these points in $B(x_0, 2^{-\alpha})$ needs to be considered in order to finish the induction.

We need the following key claim:

Claim 4.6.1 (cover-repacement)**.** *Fix η', which will be specified later. We could find a cover $\{B(y_i', s_i')\}_{i\in J_\alpha}$ such that the following holds.*

1) $\bigcup_{i\in J_\alpha} B(y_i', s_i')$ *contains* J_α *with* $d(y_i, y_i') < s_i$ *and* $s_i/5 \le s_i' \le 10s_i$

2) $\mu^a(B(y_i', s_i')) \le {s_i'}^k$

3) $\theta_{10\delta s_i'}(y_i') \ge E - \eta'$

Remark 4.6.2. *As mentioned in Introduction Section, purpose of this claim to find a substitute cover $\{B(y_i', s_i')\}_i$ with small energy pinch at new centers, which allows us to use the machinary in previous two sections in order to control the equivalent Dirac measure supported on new centers.*

The proof of this claim uses the inductive assumption that (45) holds for all scales up to $\alpha+1$, and will be postponed to the end of this section. By admitting this claim for now we will complete the estimates of I_a in which the small number $\eta'(n, \epsilon)$ will be determined.

4.7 Completion of Proving Key Lemma 4.2.1

In this subsection we will assume claim 4.6.1 and go on to complete the induction by proving (45), and hence finish the proof of the key lemma 4.2.1. From claim 4.6.1, we may choose the substitute cover $\{B(y_i', s_i')\}_{i\in J_\alpha}$ as promised in claim 4.6.1, and further extract a Vitali subcover $\{B(y_i', s_i')\}_{i=1}^{N'}$ so that $\{B(y_i', s_i'/5)\}_{i=1}^{N'}$ are disjoint, and then set

$$\mu' = \sum_{i=1}^{N'} {s_i'}^k \delta_{y_i'}$$

For μ', all center points $y_{i_0}' \in \mathrm{supp}\mu'$ and all $s_{i_0} \le 2^{-\beta} \le 2^{-\alpha-2}$ we have the following estimate induced by that of μ^a:

$$\mu'(B(y_{i_0}', 2^{-\beta})) = \sum_{y_i'\in B(y_{i_0}', 2^{-\beta})} {s_i'}^k \le 10^n \sum_{y_i\in B(y_{i_0}, 2^{-\beta+1})} s_i^k = 10^n \mu^a(B(y_{i_0}, 2^{-\beta+1})) \le 20^n C(n) 2^{-\beta k} \tag{47}$$

note that in the last inequality we used (45).

This will allow us to easily obtain a rough estimate on the scale $2^{-\alpha}$, by the simple observasion that for all $2^{-(\alpha+1)} \le s \le 2^{-(\alpha-2)}$, $B(x, s)$ is covered by at most $T(n)$ many balls $\{B(w_i, 2^{-(\alpha+2)})\}$ such that concentric balls with one-fifth radius are disjoint, and therefore

$$\mu'(B(x, s)) \le \sum \mu'(B(w_i, 2^{-(\alpha+2)}) \le T(n)C(n)20^n 2^{-(\alpha+2)k} \le D'(n)s^k \tag{48}$$

where $D'(n) \gg D(n)$. With this rough estimate, we will now use the L^2-approximation theorem to show the following:

$$\mu'(B(y_i', 2^{-\alpha})) \le D(n)2^{-\alpha k} \tag{49}$$

notice that this will be enough to conclude the inductive estimate (45) on μ_a at stage α. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu^a(B(x_0, 2^{-\alpha})) \leq \sum_{i\in J_\alpha} \mu^a(B(y_i', s_i')) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N'} {s_i'}^k \\
&\leq \mu'(B(x_0, 2^{-\alpha+8})) \leq 20^{8n} \max_{B(x',2^{-\alpha})\subset B(x_0,2^{-\alpha+8})} \{\mu'(B(x', 2^{-\alpha}))\} \\
&\leq 20^{8n} D(n) 2^{-\alpha k} = C(n) 2^{-\alpha k}
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

in the second inequality we have used the item 2) from claim 4.6.1, and in the last inequality we used (49) This completes the estimates and hence item 3) in lemma 4.2.1. Therefore it suffices to prove that (49) holds.

Next we apply the rectifiable Reifenberg theorem in order to achieve the volume estimate. Fix any $y \in \text{supp}(\mu')$. When $t \leq s_y/5$, by definition we have $D^k_{\mu'}(y,t) \equiv 0$; hence we only need to consider the case when $t > s_y/5$. As a matter of fact, from the construction of μ', $B(y, 8t)$ is $(0, \delta_0)$-symmetric. Indeed,

$$|\theta_{\delta_0 t}(y) - \theta_{16t}(y)| \leq |\theta_{10\delta s_y}(y) - \theta_1(y)| \leq \eta' < \delta$$

where we have used that $\delta = \frac{\delta_0}{100}$. Combining this with the fact that $B(y, 2t)$ is not $(k+1, \epsilon)$-symmetric, and by choosing η to be sufficiently small, we could apply Theorem 3.2.1 to see that:

$$D^k_{\mu'}(y,t) \leq Ct^{-k} \int_{B(y,2t)} \left(W_t(z) + t^{2-n} \int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 t)} |\iota_{z-x} F_A|^2 dV_g(x) \right) d\mu'(z)$$

Compute for all $s_y/5 \leq t \leq 2^{-\alpha}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&2^{\alpha k} \int_{B(x,2^{-\alpha})} D^k_{\mu'}(y,t) d\mu'(y) \\
&\leq C 2^{\alpha k} \int_{B(x,2^{-\alpha})} t^{-k} \int_{B(y,2t)} \left(W_t(z) + t^{2-n} \int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 t)} |\iota_{z-x} F_A|^2 dV_g(x) \right) d\mu'(z) d\mu'(y) \\
&\leq C 2^{\alpha k} t^{-k} \int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})} \mu'(B(z,2t)) \left(W_t(z) + t^{2-n} \int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 t)} |\iota_{z-x} F_A|^2 dV_g(x) \right) d\mu'(z) \\
&\leq C' 2^{\alpha k} \int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})} \left(W_t(z) + t^{2-n} \int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 t)} |\iota_{z-x} F_A|^2 dV_g(x) \right) d\mu'(z)
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where we interchanged the order of integral in the second line, and used the induction as well as the rough estimate (48) in the third line. Now sum up both sides of the above inequality over $t = 2^{-\beta}$ in

between $[s_y/5, 2^{-\alpha}]$, and use the definition of $W_t(z)$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-\alpha})}\sum_{s_y/5\le 2^{-\beta}\le 2^{-\alpha}} D^k_{\mu'}(y,2^{-\beta})d\mu'(y)\\
&\le C'2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})}\sum_{s_y/5\le 2^{-\beta}\le 2^{-\alpha}}\Big(W_{2^{-\beta}}(z)+(2^{-\beta})^{2-n}\int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta})}|\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2dV_g(x)\Big)d\mu'(z)\\
&\le C'2^{\alpha k}\Big(8\epsilon_1^{-1}\int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})}|\theta_{2^{-\alpha+3}}(z)-\theta_{s_y\epsilon_1/5}(z)|d\mu'(z)\\
&+\int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})}\Big(\sum_{s_y/5\le 2^{-\beta}\le 2^{-\alpha}}(2^{-\beta})^{2-n}\int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta})}|\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2dV_g(x)\Big)d\mu'(z)\Big)\\
&\le C''\epsilon_1^{-1}\eta'+C'2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-(\alpha-2)})}\Big(\sum_{s_y/5\le 2^{-\beta}\le 2^{-\alpha}}(2^{-\beta})^{2-n}\int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta})}|\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2dV_g(x)\Big)d\mu'(z)\\
&=C''\epsilon_1^{-1}\eta'+II
\end{aligned}\tag{52}$$

in the first term of the last inequality we firstly used item 3) in claim 4.6.1 and the definition of δ (see (31)); furthermore we have once again used the rough estimate (48).

Now let's turn to the estimate of the integrand inside $d\mu'$ of the second term II; using a dyadic decomposition we compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{s_y/5\le 2^{-\beta}\le 2^{-\alpha}}(2^{-\beta})^{2-n}\int_{B(z,\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta})}|\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2dV_g(x)\\
&\le\sum_{s_y/5\le 2^{-\beta}\le 2^{-\alpha}}(2^{-\beta})^{2-n}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\int_{A_{(\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k-1},\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k})}(z)}|\iota_{z-x}F_A|^2dV_g(x)\\
&\le C(n)\sum_{s_y/5\le 2^{-\beta}\le 2^{-\alpha}}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(2^{-k}\epsilon_1)^{n-2}\int_{A_{(\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k-1},\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k})}(z)}|x-z|^{4-n}|\iota_{\partial_{r_z}}F_A|^2dV_g(x)\\
&=C(n)\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(2^{-k}\epsilon_1)^{n-2}\Big(\sum_{s_y/5\le 2^{-\beta}\le 2^{-\alpha}}\int_{A_{(\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k-1},\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k})}(z)}|x-z|^{4-n}|\iota_{\partial_{r_z}}F_A|^2dV_g(x)\Big)\\
&=C(n)\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(2^{-k}\epsilon_1)^{n-2}\Big(\sum_{s_y/5\le 2^{-\beta}\le 2^{-\alpha}}\Big(\theta_{\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k}}(z)-\theta_{\epsilon_1 2^{-\beta-k-1}}(z)\Big)\Big)\\
&\le 2C(n)\Lambda\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(2^{-k}\epsilon_1)^{n-2}\\
&\le C(n,\Lambda)\epsilon_1^{n-2}
\end{aligned}\tag{53}$$

note that in both the second equality and the second last inequality we have used the monotonicity formula (2). Now insert this to the term II of the last line of (52), and again use the rough estimate (48) we get:

$$\sum_{s_y/5\le 2^{-\beta}\le 2^{-\alpha}}2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-\alpha})}D^k_{\mu'}(y,t)d\mu'(y)\le C''\epsilon_1^{-1}\eta'+C(n,\epsilon,\Lambda)\epsilon_1^{n-2}$$

recall we let $\delta(n)$ be as in Theorem 2.0.4; by firstly choosing a sufficiently small $\epsilon_1\equiv\epsilon_1(n,\epsilon,\Lambda)$ such that the second term is less than $\delta(n)^2/2$, and then choosing η' to be small enough such that the first term is

also less than $\delta(n)^2/2$ (the same $\delta(n)$ as in Theorem 2.0.4) we have:

$$\sum_{2^{-\beta}\le 2^{-\alpha}} 2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-\alpha})} D^k_{\mu'}(y,2^{-\beta})d\mu'(y) = 2^{\alpha k}\int_{B(x,2^{-\alpha})}\sum_{s_y/5\le 2^{-\beta}\le 2^{-\alpha}} D^k_{\mu'}(y,2^{-\beta})d\mu'(y) \le \delta(n)^2$$

We now apply Theorem 2.0.4 to see that

$$\mu'(B(x,2^{-\alpha})) \le D(n)2^{-\alpha k}$$

This finishes the induction and hence the estimate of U_{bad}, and item 2) in lemma 4.2.1 is proved. Therefore the proof of lemma 4.2.1 is completed.

$\diamondsuit$

4.8 Proof of Claim 4.6.1

Proof. We will revise the collection by replacing each $B(y_i,s_i)$ by a ball $B(y_i',s_i')$ that is slightly-pinched at the center and locates close to $B(y_i,s_i)$ with similar volume, which is in principle done by picking a larger ball centerd at the new point that engulves the previous one. Obviously there is a choice of such a point by the construction of $B(y_i,s_i)$. The problem is to keep the volume under control after such replacement.

Observe that, for each fixed $y_{i_0}\in B(x_0,2^{-\alpha})\cap \mathrm{supp}(\mu^a)$, we are facing two alternative cases as shown below:

Case A $\mu^a(B(y_{i_0},10s_{i_0}))\le 2s_{i_0}^k$

Case B $\mu^a(B(y_{i_0},10s_{i_0}))> 2s_{i_0}^k$

In Case A, by definition, $s_{i_0}\equiv \inf\{r\le s\le 1 : \sup_{B(x,2s)\cap B(p,1)}\theta_{\delta s}(y)\ge E-\eta\}$. Hence there is a point $y_{i_0}'\in B(y_{i_0},s_{i_0})$ such that $\theta_{\delta s_{i_0}}(y_{i_0}')\ge E-\eta$. Let $s_{i_0}'=9s_{i_0}$. Obviously $\mu^a(B(y_{i_0}',s_{i_0}'))\le \mu^a(B(y_{i_0},10s_{i_0}))\le 2s_{i_0}^k$; In Case B, we simply choose $y_{i_0}'=y_{i_0}$ and $s_{i_0}'=s_{i_0}/5$.

We claim that $\{B(y_{i_0}',s_{i_0}')\}$ chosen as above fulfills the properties listed in claim 4.6.1. Notice that item 1) and 2) in claim 4.6.1 automatically hold. In Case A, item 3) holds trivially, by choosing $\eta<\eta'$. We need only to show that in Case B, item 3) holds as well, provided $\eta(\eta',n,\epsilon)$ is further chosen to be sufficiently small.

More precisely, we will prove that under the condition in case B, namely, when $\mu^a(B(y_{i_0},10s_{i_0}))>2s_{i_0}^k$, it holds:

$$\theta_{\delta s_{i_0}}(y_{i_0})\ge E-\eta' \tag{54}$$

To see that this is enough to yield item 3) in claim 4.6.1, recall in case B we define $y_{i_0}'=y_{i_0}$ and $s_{i_0}'=s_{i_0}/5$. Then above immediately implies that $\theta_{10\delta s_{i_0}'}(y_{i_0}')\ge E-\eta'$, which is exactly item 3) in claim

4.6.1.

To prove (54) we need a lemma first.

Lemma 4.8.1. *For fixed δ', $\forall\epsilon$, $\exists\delta(\epsilon,\delta')$, $\exists r(\epsilon,\delta')$, given that*

i) *$B(x,1)$ is (k,δ) symmetric w.r.t. V_k,*

ii) *$y\in B(x,1)\backslash B_{\delta' 1}(V_k)$,*

then there exists some $r^*\geq r(\epsilon,\delta')$ such that $B(y,r^*)$ is $(k+1,\epsilon)$-symmetric.

Proof of Lemma 4.8.1. We prove by contradiction. Suppose the contrary holds. Then there exists an ϵ_0, and a sequence of stationary Yang-Mills connections A_i, sequence of numbers $\delta_i\to 0$ and $r_i\to 0$ such that $B(x_i,1)$ is (k,δ_i) symmetric w.r.t. $V_k^{(i)}$, and $y_i\in B(x_i,1)\backslash B_{\delta' 1}(V_k^{(i)})$ where no such $r^*>r_i$ exists that $B(y_i,r^*)$ is $(k+1,\epsilon_0)$ symmetric. Up to passing to a subsequence we may assume $x_i=0\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $y_i\to y_\infty$ and that the spanning points of $V_k^{(i)}$, denoted by $\{\xi_j^{(i)}\}_{j=1}^k$, converge to $\{\xi_j^{(\infty)}\}_{j=1}^k$, which spans $V_k^{(\infty)}$. Moreover, $|F_{A_i}|^2dV_g$ converges to a measure η in $*$-weak sense. Now for any $0<\sigma<\rho<R$, by equation (2), for each i and j we have

$$\rho^{4-n}\int_{B_\rho(\xi_j^{(i)})}|F_{A_i}|^2dV_g-\sigma^{4-n}\int_{B_\sigma(\xi_j^{(i)})}|F_{A_i}|^2dV_g=\int_{A_{(\sigma,\rho)}(\xi_j^{(i)})}4\tau^{4-n}|\iota_{\partial r}F_{A_i}|^2dV_g$$

but due to the fact that $B(x_i,1)$ is (k,δ_i) symmetric w.r.t. $V_k^{(i)}$, we know that the left hand side goes to zero when i goes to infinity, and hence so does the right hand side:

$$\int_{A_{(\sigma,\rho)}(x_i)}4\tau^{4-n}|\iota_{\partial r}F_{A_i}|^2dV_g\to 0 \tag{55}$$

Now employ equation (8) for any spherical function ϕ and take the limit, then apply above convergence (55), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}&\rho^{4-n}\int_{B_\rho(\xi_j^{(i)})}\phi|F_{A_i}|^2dV_g-\sigma^{4-n}\int_{B_\sigma(\xi_j^{(i)})}\phi|F_{A_i}|^2dV_g\\ =\ &\int_{A_{(\sigma,\rho)}(\xi_j^{(i)})}4|x-\xi_j^{(i)}|^{4-n}\phi|\iota_{\partial r}F_{A_i}|^2dV_g-\int_\sigma^\rho 4\tau^{3-n}\Big(\int_{B_\tau(\xi_j^{(i)})}|x-\xi_j^{(i)}|\langle\iota_{\partial r}F_{A_i},\iota_{\nabla\phi}F_{A_i}\rangle dV_g\Big)d\tau\to 0\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

On the other hand, by $*$-weak convergence, we have that

$$\rho^{4-n}\int_{B_\rho(\xi_j^{(i)})}\phi|F_{A_i}|^2dV_g-\sigma^{4-n}\int_{B_\sigma(\xi_j^{(i)})}\phi|F_{A_i}|^2dV_g\to\rho^{4-n}\int_{B_\rho(\xi_j^{(\infty)})}\phi d\eta-\sigma^{4-n}\int_{B_\sigma(\xi_j^{(\infty)})}\phi d\eta$$

Since ϕ is arbitrary, we see that η is a cone measure inside $B(0,1)$ with respect to $\xi_1^{(\infty)},\cdots,\xi_k^{(\infty)}$. More precisely:

$$d\eta(x)=r_j(x)^{n-5}dr_j\wedge d\psi_j(\theta)\text{ where }r_j(x)=dist(\xi_j^{(\infty)},x)\ \forall x\in B(0,1)$$

we know from this we see that η is independent of variables $\xi_1^{(\infty)}, \cdots, \xi_k^{(\infty)}$, and especially that for any fixed $s < 1/2$, the function $\eta(B(y,s))$ is constant in $V' \cap B(0,1)$ for any k-plane V' that is parallel to $V_k^{(\infty)}$.

Consider the limit point y_∞. On the one hand, there exists r^* small enough such that

$$|\theta(y_\infty, 10r^*) - \theta(y_\infty, \epsilon_0 r^*/10)| < \epsilon_0/10$$

On the other hand let V_{y_∞} be the k-plane parallel to $V_k^{(\infty)}$ and passes through y_∞. We may find k points $y_{\infty,l}$ in $B(y_\infty, r^*)$ (indeed lying on $V_k^{(\infty)}$) such that together with y_∞ they $\tau(n)$-effectively span $V_k^{(\infty)}$. Moreover due to the constancy of $\eta(B(y,s))$ on $V_{y_\infty} \cap B(0,1)$ for any $s < 1/2$, they have the same energy pinche as at y_∞:

$$|\theta(y_{\infty,l}, 10r^*) - \theta(y_{\infty,l}, \epsilon_0 r^*/10)| < \epsilon_0/10, \ l = 1, \cdots, k$$

Now we turn to the fact that $y_\infty \in B(x_\infty, 1) \backslash B_{\delta'}(V_k^\infty)$. Recall that $\eta(B(y,s))$ is constant on V_k^∞, while every point on V_k^∞ is strictly 0-symmetric. Let y_∞^{proj} to be the projection image of y_∞ onto V_k^∞. Denote by y_{r^*} the point on $\partial B(y_\infty, r^*)$ that also lies on the ray through y_∞^{proj} and y_∞. By further choosing an even smaller r^*, we get:

$$|1 - \eta(B(y_{r^*}, s)/\eta(B(y_\infty, s))| < \epsilon_0/10, \ \forall\ \epsilon_0, \ r^*/10 < s < 10r^*$$

from which the following holds:

$$|\theta(y_\infty^{proj}, 5r^*) - \theta(y_\infty^{proj}, \epsilon_0 r^*/5)| < \epsilon_0/5$$

What's more, $y_{r^*}, y_{\infty,1}, \cdots, y_{\infty,k}$ $2\tau(n)r^*$-effectively span a $(k+1)$-plane through y_∞.

Hence, for all i large enough, we have $k+1$ points $y_{r^*}^{(i)}, y_{i,1}, \cdots, y_{i,k}$ that $\tau(n)r^*$-effectively span a $(k+1)$-plane through y_i, with

$$|\theta(\cdot, 3r^*) - \theta(\cdot, 3\epsilon_0 r^*/3)| < \epsilon_0/3$$

at those points.

By definition, this implies the $(k+1, \epsilon_0)$ symmetry on $B(y_i, r^*)$ for all i large enough. This is a contradiction since $r^* > r_i$ for all i sufficiently large. Therefore we proved lemma 4.8.1.

$\diamondsuit$

With this lemma established we could now go on to show (54). But let's first give a philosophical view here why we expect (54) to be true in view of lemma 4.8.1, which lies in the heart of the entire proof. In fact, one could think of the energy $\theta_r(x)$ as a continuous function that will be maximized and "be constant in r-variable", only at cone points (or cone plane). Hence the closer that y_{i_0} to the cone plane is, the smaller the energy pinch at y_{i_0} is. This being said, to show (54), almost equals to show that y_{i_0} being close to some k-cone plane. To see this firstly we will use a simple ball counting argument to show that there is a k-dimensional cone plane inside $B(y_{i_0}, s_{i_0}/5)$ which is $\tau(n)s_{i_0}$-effectively spanned by $k+1$ "almost-cone tips". Now it becomes acceptable that y_{i_0} is close to this plane, for otherwise lemma 4.8.1 tells us that $B(y_{i_0}, r^*)$ is $(k+1, \epsilon)$ symmetric for some $r^* > r$, which means $y_{i_0} \notin S_{\epsilon,r}^k$. This gives a contradiction.

Now we begin to prove (54). Indeed, due to $\mu^a(B(y_{i_0}, 10s_{i_0})) > 2s_{i_0}^k$ and the disjointness of $\{B(y_{i_0}, s_{i_0}/5)\}$, we see that there is at least one point y_j different from y_{i_0} such that $y_j \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu^a) \cap A_{(s_{i_0}/5, 10s_{i_0})}(y_{i_0})$.

By choosing $R \gg 10$, and the property of I_a as stated in Lemma 4.5.3, we see that $s_j < R^{-2}s_{i_0}$. On the other hand by definition we have $s_j > r$. Hence we observe that:

$$s_{i_0} > Rr \tag{57}$$

also, due to the disjointness of $B(x_0, s_{x_0}/5)$ and any $B(y_{i_0}, s_{i_0}/5)$, we know that $s_{i_0}/5 \leq 2^{-\alpha}$ for every $y_{i_0} \in B(x_0, 2^{-\alpha})$. Hence for every $y_j \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu^a) \cap A_{(s_{i_0}/5, 10s_{i_0})}(y_{i_0})$, we have

$$s_j \leq R^{-2}s_{i_0} \leq R^{-2}5 \cdot 2^{-\alpha} < 2^{-(\alpha+2)}$$

Therefore the inductive estimates (45) works for all balls centerd at $\mathrm{supp}(\mu^a) \cap A_{(s_{i_0}/5, 10s_{i_0})}(y_{i_0})$ and all scales up to $\alpha + 1$. We claim that there exist $k+1$ points $y_j \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu^a) \cap A_{(s_{i_0}/5, 10s_{i_0})}(y_{i_0})$ $(j = 1, \cdots, k+1)$ such that they $200\tau(n)s_{i_0}$-effectively span some k-plane. Suppose not. Then all the points $\mathrm{supp}(\mu^a) \cap A_{(s_{i_0}/5, 10s_{i_0})}(y_{i_0})$ are contained in a $200\tau(n)s_{i_0}$-tubular neighborhood of a $k-1$-plane, $B_{200\tau(n)s_{i_0}}(V_{k-1})$. Now we cover $A_{(s_{i_0}/5, 10s_{i_0})}(y_{i_0}) \cap B_{200\tau(n)s_{i_0}}(V_{k-1})$ by balls centerd at $\mathrm{supp}(\mu^a)$ with radius equals to $200\tau(n)s_{i_0}$. By standard ball counting argument we could choose a subcover that consists of $20^n(200\tau(n))^{1-k}$ such balls. Since $200\tau(n)s_{i_0} < 2^{-(\alpha+2)}$, we could apply the inductive estimates (46) and the definition of μ^a as in (44) to obtain:

$$\mu^a(A_{(s_{i_0}/5, 10s_{i_0})}(y_{i_0})) \leq 20^n(200\tau(n))^{1-k}C(n)(200\tau(n)s_{i_0})^k < s_{i_0}^k$$

where $\tau(n) = 20^{-2n}C(n)^{-1} = 20^{-10n}D(n)^{-1}$ is used. This contradicts the condition in case B that $\mu^a(B(y_{i_0}, 10s_{i_0})) > 2s_{i_0}^k$.

Hence we could pick $k+1$ points $y_j \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu^a) \cap A_{(s_{i_0}/5, 10s_{i_0})}(y_{i_0})$ $(j = 1, \cdots, k+1)$ which $200\tau(n)s_{i_0}$-effectively span a k-plane. By definition, in each $B(y_j, 2s_j)$, there is a point $\tilde{y_j}$ such that $E - \eta \leq \theta_{\delta s_j}(\tilde{y_j}) \leq \theta_{\delta R^{-2}s_{i_0}}(\tilde{y_j})$. If we choose R to be large enough, then the points $\tilde{y_j}$ are $(\max\{\eta, \delta R^{-2}\}, 40s_{i_0})$-cone tips that $200\tau(n)s_{i_0}$-effectively span a k-plane $\tilde{V}$ w.r.t. $B(\tilde{y_1}, 40s_{i_0})$, a ball that contains $B(y_{i_0}, 10s_{i_0})$.

By definition, the ball $B(\tilde{y_1}, 40s_{i_0})$ is $(k, \max\{\eta, \delta R^{-2}\})$-symmetric (with respect to $\tilde{V}$). Denote $\max\{\eta, \delta R^{-2}\}$ by $\hat{\epsilon}$; we need the following lemma:

Lemma 4.8.2. *There exist $\hat{\epsilon}(\eta', \delta, n, \Lambda)$ and $\delta'(\eta', \delta, n, \Lambda)$, such that for all $x \in B(y_{i_0}, 10s_{i_0}) \cap B_{\delta' s_{i_0}}(\tilde{V})$, and all $t \in [\frac{\delta s_{i_0}}{10}, 2]$, it holds*

$$\theta_t(x) > E - \eta'$$

where δ is specified in (31).

Remark 4.8.3. *This lemma quantitatively describe the fact that energy is maximized only at cone tip(s).*

Proof of Lemma 4.8.2. First of all, by weak compactness and a simple argument by contradiction, one could easily show that there exists $\hat{\epsilon}(\eta', \delta, n, \Lambda)$, given that $B(\tilde{y_1}, 40s_{i_0})$ is $(k, \hat{\epsilon})$-symmetric w.r.t. $\tilde{V}$, then $\forall z \in \tilde{V} \cap B(y_{i_0}, 15s_{i_0})$ it holds

$$\theta_{\frac{\delta}{20}s_{i_0}}(z) > E - \frac{\eta'}{2} \tag{58}$$

We omit the details of this argument since it is rather similar as several preceding proofs. Now choose some δ' to be specified later; for every $y \in B(y_{i_0}, 10s_{i_0}) \cap B_{\delta' s_{i_0}}(\tilde{V})$ denote by y^* the best approximation

point of y lying on $\tilde{V}$; clearly $y^* \in B(y_{i_0}, 15s_{i_0})$; we compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta_{\frac{\delta}{10}s_{i_0}}(y) \\
&= (\frac{\delta}{10}s_{i_0})^{4-n} \int_{B(y,\frac{\delta}{10}s_{i_0})} |F_A|^2(z) d\mathrm{Vol}(z) \\
&\geq (\frac{\delta}{10}s_{i_0})^{4-n} \int_{B(y^*,(\frac{\delta}{10}-\delta')s_{i_0})} |F_A|^2(z) d\mathrm{Vol}(z) \\
&= \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta - 10\delta'}\right)^{4-n} \left((\frac{\delta}{10} - \delta')s_{i_0}\right)^{4-n} \int_{B(y^*,(\frac{\delta}{10}-\delta')s_{i_0})} |F_A|^2(z) d\mathrm{Vol}(z) \\
&\geq \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta - 10\delta'}\right)^{4-n} (E - \frac{\eta'}{2}) \\
&> E - \eta'
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where in the second inequality we choose δ' sufficiently small such that $(\frac{\delta}{10} - \delta')s_{i_0} > \frac{\delta}{20}s_{i_0}$ in order to apply (58), and by further decreasing δ' we could make the last inequality holds too. Apparently, δ' only depends on η', δ, n and Λ. Hence we complete the proof of lemma 4.8.2. ♢

Choose η and R^{-1} sufficiently small such that $\hat{\epsilon} = \max\{\eta, \delta R^{-2}\}$ works in lemma 4.8.2. We now apply the rescaled version of lemma 4.8.1, with ϵ the same as in $S^k_{\epsilon,r}$ and δ' chosen as in lemma 4.8.2; by further decreasing η and R^{-1} if necessary, to see that there exists $r^* \geq \tilde{r}(\epsilon, \delta')$, such that if $z \in B(y_{i_0}, 10s_{i_0}) \backslash B_{\delta' s_{i_0}}(\tilde{V})$, we have

$$B(z, r^* s_{i_0}) \text{ is } (k+1, \epsilon)\text{-symmetric} \tag{60}$$

Especially, if we choose $z = y_{i_0}$ and suppose $y_{i_0} \in B(y_{i_0}, 10s_{i_0}) \backslash B_{\delta' s_{i_0}}(\tilde{V})$, we have that $B(y_{i_0}, r^* s_{i_0})$ is $(k+1, \epsilon)$-symmetric. However, using (57), we see that $r^* s_{i_0} \geq \tilde{r}(\epsilon, \delta') s_{i_0} > \tilde{r}(\epsilon, \delta') R r$. Therefore we are able to make $r^* s_{i_0} > r$ by further increasing R at the beginning, so that it holds $\tilde{r}(\epsilon, \delta') R > 1$. But then this leads to a contradiction because $y_{i_0} \in S^k_{\epsilon,r}$ means that no ball $B(y_{i_0}, s)$ with $s \geq r$ is $(k+1, \epsilon)$-symmetric. Hence it is impossible that $y_{i_0} \in B(y_{i_0}, 10s_{i_0}) \backslash B_{\delta' s_{i_0}}(\tilde{V})$. In other word, $y_{i_0} \in B(y_{i_0}, 10s_{i_0}) \cap B_{\delta' s_{i_0}}(\tilde{V})$; lemma 4.8.2 then implies $\theta_{\delta s_{i_0}}(y_{i_0}) > E - \eta'$, which is exactly (54). This finishes the proof of claim 4.6.1.

♢

With the key lemma 4.2.1, we could now proceed to prove the main Theorems.

5 Completion of the Proofs of the Main Results

Proof of Theorem 1.4.1. Let E, η, δ be the same as specified in last section. Set $L = 1 + [E/\eta]$, i.e. the least integer that is greater than E/η. Clearly, to prove the volume estimate (9) it suffices to prove it for all $r \leq \delta^L$. For such r let's set $\hat{r} := \delta^{-L} r \leq 1$. We claim that we will finish the proof by proceeding at most L stages. Roughly speaking, we apply the key lemma 4.2.1 to the "bad" set obtained from last stage and thus jump to the next stage; note that this process will terminate after L stages because the energy drops by η after every stage. Eventually we will obtain a cover of the set $B_r(S^k_{\epsilon,r})$ by balls whose

radii all lie in between $[r, \hat{r}]$, and with the total volume being controlled by $C(n, \Lambda, \epsilon) r^{n-k}$; thus the proof is completed. More precisely, we make the following proposition:

5.1 Energy Drop Induction

Proposition 5.1.1. *For all integer $l \geq 0$, there are constants $C_l(n, \Lambda, \epsilon)$, such that at the l^{th} stage, we have that*

$$B_r(S^k_{\epsilon,r}) \subset U^{(l)}_{good} \cup U^{(l)}_{bad} := \bigcup_i B(x_i, \delta^{l_i}\hat{r}) \cup \bigcup_j B(y_j, r_j)$$

with $l \leq l_i \leq L$. Furthermore,

1) $r^{k-n}\, Vol(\bigcup_i B(x_i, \delta^{l_i}\hat{r})) + \sum_j r_j^k \leq C_l(n, \Lambda, \epsilon)$

2) $E_{B(y_j,r_j)} := \sup_{B(y_j,r_j)} \theta_{r_j}(y) \leq E - l\eta$

3) *If for some $B(y_j, r_j)$ and some integer l_0 it happens to hold $E_{B(y_j,r_j)} > E - l_0\eta$, then we must also have $r_j \geq \delta^{l_0}\hat{r}$*

Remark 5.1.2. *Since for each $B(y_j, r_j)$ there must be some integer $l_0 < L$ such that $E_{B(y_j,r_j)} \geq E - l_0\eta$, then from item 3) we know that $r_j \geq \delta^{l_0}\hat{r} > r$. Especially, all balls in the U_{bad} part in all stages have radii greater than r.*

Proof of Proposition 5.1.1. We prove by induction on the stage. We begin with the trivial stage $l = 0$, where we simply set $U^{(0)}_{good} = \emptyset$ and let $U^{(0)}_{bad}$ consist of the ball $B(p, 1)$ only. Obviously, all items in above proposition are automatically satisfied. Now we start to prove proposition 5.1.1 for stage $l + 1$ based on the inductive assumption that it holds for all stages up to l.

Fix any ball in $U^{(l)}_{bad}$, and denote it by $B(x^*, r^*)$. As in item 2) above we define

$$E_{B(x^*,r^*)} = \sup_{y \in B(x^*,r^*)} \theta_{r^*}(y)$$

Let's first find the unique integer k^* such that

$$E_{B(x^*,r^*)} \in (E - (k^* + 1)\eta, E - k^*\eta] \tag{61}$$

According to the inductive assumption that item 2) and 3) hold for stage l, we have

$$k^* \geq l \tag{62}$$

and

$$r^* \geq \delta^{k^*+1}\hat{r} \tag{63}$$

We are now facing two alternative situations:

Case a)

$$\sup_{B(x^*,r^*)} \theta_{\delta r^*}(y) \geq E_{B(x^*,r^*)} - \eta \tag{64}$$

Case b)

$$\sup_{B(x^*,r^*)} \theta_{\delta r^*}(y) < E_{B(x^*,r^*)} - \eta \tag{65}$$

Now we are going to prove item 1), 2), 3) in the next 3 subsections, and each proof is devided into discussions under case a) and b) respectively.

5.2 Proof of Item 1)

In case a), similar as in (32), we could define the energy scale for each $x \in B(x^*, r^*)$ to be:

$$s'_x := \inf\big\{ s \in [\delta^{k^*+1}\hat{r}, r^*] : \sup_{y \in B(x,2s) \cap B(x^*,r^*)} \theta_{\delta s}(y) \geq E_{B(x^*,r^*)} - \eta \big\} \tag{66}$$

Now, by rescaling the radius of $B(x^*, r^*)$ to 1 we see that the definition (66) becomes (32), while (64) coincide with the condition (33) in lemma 4.2.1. Hence we may apply lemma 4.2.1 to the rescaled ball $B(x^*, 1, {r^*}^{-2}g)$ by firstly replacing r by $\frac{\delta^{k^*+1}\hat{r}}{r^*}$ and E by $E_{B(x^*,r^*)}$, and then scale back to $B(x^*, r^*)$; we will have:

$$B(x^*, r^*) \cap S^k_{\epsilon,r} \subset B(x^*, r^*) \cap S^k_{\epsilon,\delta^{k^*+1}\hat{r}} \subset \bigcup_i B(x_i, \delta^{k^*+1}\hat{r}) \cup \bigcup_j B(y_j, r_j)$$

such that:

$$(\delta^{k^*+1}\hat{r})^{k-n} \mathrm{Vol}(\bigcup_i B(x_i, \delta^{k^*+1}\hat{r})) + \sum_j r_j^k \leq C(n, \Lambda, \epsilon) {r^*}^k \tag{67}$$

$$E_{B(y_j,r_j)} \leq E_{B(x^*,r^*)} - \eta \tag{68}$$

$$r_j \in (\delta^{k^*+2}\hat{r}, \delta r^*] \tag{69}$$

using (67), we immediately have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & r^{k-n} \mathrm{Vol}(\bigcup_i B(x_i, \delta^{k^*+1}\hat{r})) + \sum_j r_j^k \\ \leq\ & C(\delta)(\delta^{k^*+1}\hat{r})^{k-n} \mathrm{Vol}(\bigcup_i B(x_i, \delta^{k^*+1}\hat{r})) + \sum_j r_j^k \\ \leq\ & C'(n, \Lambda, \epsilon) {r^*}^k \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

This completes the discussion of case a).

In case b), for each $x \in B(x^*, r^*)$, we first define:

$$l_x = \inf\big\{ l : \sup_{y \in B(x, 2\delta^l r^*) \cap B(x^*, r^*)} \theta_{\delta^{l+1} r^*}(y) > E_{B(x^*,r^*)} - (l+1)\eta \big\}$$

clearly, $1 \leq l_x < L$ for all $x \in B(x^*, r^*)$. We could cover $S^k_{\epsilon,r} \cap B(x^*, r^*)$ by Vitali Cover $\{B(\tilde{x_i}, \delta^{l_{\tilde{x_i}}} r^*)\}_i$. Because $l_{\tilde{x_i}}$ are uniformly bounded above by L, we could assume w.l.o.g. that this cover consists of at most $N \equiv N(n, \delta, L) = N(n, \Lambda, \epsilon)$ many balls, followed from standard covering argument. Now fix any $B(x, \delta^{l_x} r^*)$ in this cover. From the definition of l_x we readily obtain the following:

$$E_{B(x,\delta^{l_x} r^*)} := \sup_{y \in B(x, \delta^{l_x} r^*)} \theta_{\delta^{l_x} r^*}(y) \leq \sup_{y \in B(x, \delta^{l_x - 1} r^*)} \theta_{\delta^{l_x} r^*}(y) \leq E_{B(x^*,r^*)} - l_x \eta \tag{71}$$

and therefore:

$$\sup_{y\in B(x,2\delta^{l_x+1}r^*)\cap B(x^*,r^*)}\theta_{\delta^{l_x+1}r^*}(y) > E_{B(x^*,r^*)} - (l_x+1)\eta \geq E_{B(x,\delta^{l_x}r^*)} - \eta \tag{72}$$

once again, we define the energy scale for all $q \in B(x,\delta^{l_x}r^*)$ as we did before:

$$s'_q := \inf\left\{s \in [\delta^{l_x+k^*+1}\hat{r}, \delta^{l_x}r^*] : \sup_{y\in B(q,2s)\cap B(x^*,r^*)}\theta_{\delta s}(y) \geq E_{B(x,\delta^{l_x}r^*)} - \eta\right\} \tag{73}$$

(by (71) and (61) clearly we have $l_x + k^* + 1 \leq L$)

By rescaling the radius of $B(x,\delta^{l_x}r^*)$ to 1 we see that the definition (73) becomes (32), while (72) coincide with the condition (33) in lemma 4.2.1. Hence we may apply lemma 4.2.1 to the rescaled ball $B(x,1,(\delta^{l_x}r^*)^{-2}g)$ by firstly replacing r by $\frac{\delta^{k^*+1}\hat{r}}{r^*}$ and E by $E_{B(x^*,r^*)}$, and then scale back to $B(x,\delta^{l_x}r^*)$; we will have:

$$B(x,\delta^{l_x}r^*)\cap S^k_{\epsilon,r} \subset B(x,\delta^{l_x}r^*)\cap S^k_{\epsilon,\delta^{l_x+k^*+1}\hat{r}} \subset \bigcup_i B(x_i,\delta^{l_x+k^*+1}\hat{r}) \cup \bigcup_j B(y_j,r_j)$$

such that:

$$(\delta^{l_x+k^*+1}\hat{r})^{k-n}\mathrm{Vol}(\bigcup_i B(x_i,\delta^{l_x+k^*+1}\hat{r})) + \sum_j r_j^k \leq C(n,\Lambda,\epsilon)\delta^{l_x}{r^*}^k \tag{74}$$

$$E_{B(y_j,r_j)} \leq E_{B(x,\delta^{l_x}r^*)} - \eta \tag{75}$$

$$r_j \in (\delta^{l_x+k^*+2}\hat{r}, \delta^{l_x+1}r^*] \tag{76}$$

Note that $B(x,\delta^{l_x}r^*)$ is an arbitrary ball in the cover $\{B(\tilde{x_i},\delta^{l_{\tilde{x_i}}}r^*)\}_i$ which consists of at most $N(n,\Lambda,\epsilon)$ such balls; we then estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} &r^{k-n}\mathrm{Vol}(\bigcup_{\tilde{x_i}}\bigcup_j B(x_j,\delta^{l_{\tilde{x_i}}+k^*+1}\hat{r})) + \sum_{\tilde{x_i}}\sum_j r_j^k \\ &\leq C(\delta)\sum_{\tilde{x_i}}(\delta^{l_{\tilde{x_i}}+k^*+1}\hat{r})^{k-n}\mathrm{Vol}(\bigcup_j B(x_j,\delta^{l_{\tilde{x_i}}+k^*+1}\hat{r})) \\ &+ \sum_{\tilde{x_i}}\sum_j r_j^k \leq C(n,\Lambda,\epsilon)\sum_{\tilde{x_i}}(\delta^{l_{\tilde{x_i}}}r^*)^k \leq C'(n,\Lambda,\epsilon)N(n,\Lambda,\epsilon){r^*}^k \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

where we have used (74) in the second last inequality. Hence, in both case a) and b) we end up obtaining a group of good balls and a group of bad balls. We simply let $U^{(l+1)}_{good}$ (or $U^{(l+1)}_{bad}$) be the union of $U^{(l)}_{good}$ (or $U^{(l)}_{bad}$) with all the good balls (or bad balls) we obtained from this stage. Now we could start to check

item 1) in proposition 5.1.1 for stage $l+1$. We estimate the total volume of the good part as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&r^{k-n}\mathrm{Vol}(U_{good}^{(l+1)}) \\
&\leq r^{k-n}\mathrm{Vol}(U_{good}^{(l)}) + r^{k-n}\sum_{B(x^*,r^*)\in case(a)} \mathrm{Vol}(\bigcup_i B(x_i,\delta^{k^*+1}\hat{r})) \\
&+ r^{k-n}\sum_{B(x^*,r^*)\in case(b)}\Big(\sum_{B(\tilde{x_i},\delta^{l_{\tilde{x_i}}}r^*)} \mathrm{Vol}(\bigcup_{\tilde{x_i}}\bigcup_j B(x_j,\delta^{l_{\tilde{x_i}}+k^*+1}\hat{r}))\Big) \\
&\leq C_l(n,\Lambda,\epsilon) + C(n,\Lambda,\epsilon)\sum_{B(x^*,r^*)\in case(a)\&(b)} r^{*k} \\
&= C_l(n,\Lambda,\epsilon) + C(n,\Lambda,\epsilon)\sum_{B(x^*,r^*)\in U_{bad}^{(l)}} r^{*k} \\
&\leq C_l(n,\Lambda,\epsilon) + C(n,\Lambda,\epsilon)C_l(n,\Lambda,\epsilon) \\
&= C_{l+1}(n,\Lambda,\epsilon)
\end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

where in the second inequality we used the induction assumption as well as (70) and (77), and used the inductive assumption again in the last inequality; likewise we estimate the volume of the bad part as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{U_{bad}^{(l+1)}} r_j^k \\
&\leq \sum_{U_{bad}^{(l)}} r_j^k + \sum_{B(x^*,r^*)\in case(a)}\sum_j r_j^k + \sum_{B(x^*,r^*)\in case(b)}\Big(\sum_{B(\tilde{x_i},\delta^{l_{\tilde{x_i}}}r^*)}\sum_j r_j^k\Big) \\
&\leq C_l(n,\Lambda,\epsilon) + C(n,\Lambda,\epsilon)\sum_{B(x^*,r^*)\in case(a)\&(b)} r^{*k} \\
&= C_l(n,\Lambda,\epsilon) + C(n,\Lambda,\epsilon)\sum_{B(x^*,r^*)\in U_{bad}^{(l)}} r^{*k} \\
&\leq C_l(n,\Lambda,\epsilon) + C(n,\Lambda,\epsilon)C_l(n,\Lambda,\epsilon) \\
&= C_{l+1}(n,\Lambda,\epsilon)
\end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

where in the second inequality we used the induction assumption as well as (70) and (77), and used the inductive assumption again in the last inequality; this finishes the proof of item 1).

5.3 Proof of Item 2)

To prove item 2), note that in case a), from (61), (62) and (68), we have:

$$E_{B(y_j,r_j)} \leq E_{B(x^*,r^*)} - \eta \leq E - (k^*+1)\eta \leq E - (l+1)\eta \tag{80}$$

while in case b), by (61), (71), and(75), we have:

$$E_{B(y_j,r_j)} \leq E_{B(\tilde{x_i},\delta^{l_{\tilde{x_i}}}r^*)} - \eta \leq E - (k^* + l_{\tilde{x_i}} + 1)\eta < E - (l+1)\eta \tag{81}$$

Hence we proved item 2).

5.4 Proof of Item 3)

Lastly we verify item 3). In case a), (80) implies that when $E_{B(y_j,r_j)} > E - l_0\eta$ for some l_0, then we must have $l_0 \geq k^* + 2$. On the other hand, from (69), we know that

$$r_j > \delta^{k^*+2}\hat{r} \geq \delta^{l_0}\hat{r}$$

In case b), (81) implies that when $E_{B(y_j,r_j)} > E - l_0\eta$ for some l_0, then we must have $l_0 \geq k^* + l_{\tilde{x_i}} + 2$. On the other hand, from (76), we know that

$$r_j > \delta^{k^*+l_{\tilde{x_i}}+2}\hat{r} \geq \delta^{l_0}\hat{r}$$

This proves item 3), and hence the proof of proposition 5.1.1. ♢

5.5 Proof of Theorem 1.4.1

In order to finish the proof of 1.4.1, let's take $l = L$ in proposition (5.1.1). Clearly U_{bad} is empty. Hence, by item 1), we have that: $\mathrm{Vol}(\bigcup_i B(x_i, r_i)) \leq C_L(n, \Lambda, \epsilon)r^{n-k}$, with $r_i \in [r, \delta^{-L}r]$. Especially, by standard volume comparison, we have:

$$\mathrm{Vol}(B_r(S^k_{\epsilon,r}(A)) \cap B(p,1)) \leq C(n,\epsilon,\Lambda)r^{n-k}$$

Thus we proved Theorem 1.4.1.

♢

5.6 Proof of Theorem 1.4.2 and 1.4.3

Proof of Theorem 1.4.2. We need a inductive process similar as proposition 5.1.1, stated as follows:

Proposition 5.6.1. *For all integer $l \geq 0$, there are constants $C_l(n, \Lambda, \epsilon)$, such that at the l^{th} stage, we have that*

$$S^k_\epsilon \subset U^{(l)}_{good}(0) \cup U^{(l)}_{bad}(0) := U^{(l)}_{good}(0) \cup \bigcup_j B(y_j, r_j)$$

such that the following hold,

1) $H^k(U^{(l)}_{good}(0)) + \sum_j r^k_j \leq C_l(n, \Lambda, \epsilon)$

2) $U^{(l)}_{good}(0)$ *is k-rectifiable*

3) $E_{B(y_j,r_j)} := \sup_{B(y_j,r_j)} \theta_{r_j}(y) \leq E - l\eta$

4) *If for some $B(y_j, r_j)$ and some integer l_0 it happens to hold $E_{B(y_j,r_j)} > E - l_0\eta$, then we must also have $r_j \geq \delta^{l_0}\hat{r}$*

Proof of Proposition 5.6.1. The proof goes the same as that of (5.1.1) with the only difference being that, instead of using items 1), 3), 4) from lemma 4.2.1, we use items 2), 3), 4) from lemma 4.2.1 in order to obtain the rectifiability of $U^{(l)}_{good}$ and the Hausdorff measure estimate of it. ♢

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.4.2, we simply take $l = L$ in proposition (5.6.1). Clearly U_{bad} is empty. Hence we have $S^k_\epsilon = U^L_{good}$; by item 1), we know $H_k(S^k_\epsilon) = H^k(U^{(l)}_{good}(0)) \leq C(n, \epsilon, \Lambda)$, and by item 2) we see that S^k_ϵ is rectifiable. In this way we are done with Theorem 1.4.2. ♢

Proof of Theorem 1.4.3. Clear from Theorem 1.4.2. ♢

5.7 Proof of Theorem 1.4.6

Proof. Let $|F_{A_i}|^2 dV_g \to \mu := |F_{A_\infty}|^2 dV_g + \Theta dH^{n-4}\big|_S$ in $*$-weak sense, where Θ is a positive function that is supported and H^{n-4} a.e. bounded on S. Note that $S = S^{n-4}(\mu)$. Let's choose a Vitali cover of $B_r(S^k_{\epsilon,r}(\mu))$ by $\{B(x_i, 5r)\}_{i=1}^M$ with $x_i \in S^k_{\epsilon,r}(\mu)$ such that $\{B(x_i, r)\}_{i=1}^M$ are disjoint. By using $*$-weak convergence of $|F_{A_i}|^2 dV_g \to \mu$ and an argument by contradiction, we see that there is a large N such that for all $j \geq N$ and $i = 1, \cdots, M$ we have $x_i \in S^k_{\epsilon/2,2r}(A_j)$. Now we apply (9) to A_j for all sufficiently large j and estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Vol}(B_r(S^k_{\epsilon,r}(\mu))) &\leq \sum_i \mathrm{Vol}(B(x_i, 5r)) \leq C(n) \sum_i \mathrm{Vol}(B(x_i, r)) \\ &\leq C(n)\mathrm{Vol}(B_{2r}(S^k_{\epsilon/2,2r}(A_j))) \leq C(n, \epsilon, \Lambda) r^{n-k} \end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

Similarly we obtain that the Minkowski volume estimate and rectifiability for $S^k_\epsilon(\mu)$ and so is the rectifiability of $S^k(\mu)$. Specifically we have recovered the $(n-4)$-rectifiability of $S^{n-4}(\mu)$. Now we are only left with proving the inclusion relations. Let's start with proving $S^k_{\epsilon,r}(A_\infty) \subset S^k_{\epsilon,r}(\mu)$. It suffices to prove the opposite inclusion relation between their complements. Choose any point x_0 such that there exists $s \geq r$ with the property that μ is $(k+1, \epsilon)$-symmetric in $B(x_0, s)$. By definition there are $x_0, \cdots, x_{k+1}$ of μ in $B(x, s/2)$ that $\tau(n)s$-effectively span a $k+1$-plane, such that for each $i = 0 \cdots, k+1$ it holds:

$$\theta^{(\mu)}_{2s}(x_i) - \theta^{(\mu)}_{2\epsilon s}(x_i) \leq \epsilon$$

From [G. Tian] we have the following holds for each i:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{S \cap A_{(2\epsilon s, 2s)}(x_i)} |x - x_i|^{4-n} |\nabla^\perp r_i|^2 \Theta dH^{n-4}(x) + 4 \int_{A_{(2\epsilon s, 2s)}(x_i)} |x - x_i|^{4-n} |\iota_{\partial r_i} F_{A_\infty}|^2 dV_g \\ =&\theta^{(\mu)}_{2s}(x_i) - \theta^{(\mu)}_{2\epsilon s}(x_i) \end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

where $\nabla^\perp r_i$ denotes the component of ∇r_i that is perpendicular to the tangent space of S (from the $(n-4)$-recifiability of S we see that $\nabla^\perp r$ is H^{n-4}-a.e. well defined on S). Especially, this implies that A_∞ is $(k+1, \epsilon)$-symmetric in $B(x_0, s)$. Hence $S^k_{\epsilon,r}(A_\infty) \subset S^k_{\epsilon,r}(\mu)$.

Now we show that $\mathcal{WS}^k(A_\infty) \subset S^k(\mu)$. Indeed let x_0 be any point such that there is a tangent measure of μ denoted by η that is $k+1$-symmetric. By definition there are sequences $\lambda_i \to 0$ and $\epsilon_i \to 0$ such that for each i there are $(\epsilon_i, 1)$-cone tips of μ_{λ_i} in $B(x_0, 1/2, \lambda_i^{-2} g)$, denoted by $x_0, p^{(i)}_1, \cdots, p^{(i)}_{k+1}$,

that $\tau(n)$-effectively span a $k+1$-plane. Up to passing to subsequence we may assume that $p_l^{(i)} \to p_l^{(\infty)}$ for each $l = 1, \cdots, k+1$. Then similar as (83) we derive:

$$4\int_{A_{(2\epsilon_i,2)}(p_l^{(i)})} |x - p_l^{(i)}|^{4-n} |\iota_{\partial r_{p_l^{(i)}}} F_{(A_\infty)_{\lambda_i}}|^2 dV_g \leq \theta_2^{(\mu_{\lambda_i})}(p_l^{(i)}) - \theta_{2\epsilon_i}^{(\mu_{\lambda_i})}(p_l^{(i)}) \leq \epsilon_i \tag{84}$$

On the other hand up to further passing to subsequence we have $(A_\infty)_{\lambda_i} \to \tilde{A}_{x_0}$ smoothly up to gauge outside a (cone) singular set $\tilde{S}$. Especially, by (84) and Fatou's Lemma we have:

$$\iota_{\partial r_{p_l^{(\infty)}}} F_{\tilde{A}_{x_0}}(x) = 0, \ \forall x \in B(x_0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$$

from the property that $\tilde{A}_{x_0}$ is cone connection., we see that $\tilde{A}_{x_0}$ is $k+1$-symmetric. Hence we conclude that $\mathcal{WS}^k(A_\infty) \subset S^k(\mu)$.

$\diamondsuit$

6 References

[J. Cheeger and A. Naber] Lower Bounds on Ricci Curvature and Quantitative Behavior of Singular Sets, Inventiones mathematicae, vol. 191, issue 2, pp. 321-339

[J. Cheeger and A. Naber] Quantitative stratification and the regularity of harmonic maps and minimal currents, Comm. Pure and Appl. Math. (2012). Available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1107.3097.

[S. K. Donaldson, P. B. Kronheimer] The geometry of four-manifolds, Oxford University Press, 1990.

[L. C. Evans, R. F. Gariepy] Measure theory and fine properties of functions, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1992.

[S. Leon] Theorems on Regularity and Singularity of Energy Minimizing Maps, Lectures in Mathematics. ETH Zrich

[FH. Lin] Gradient estimates and blow-up analysis for stationary harmonic maps, Annals of Mathematics, 149 (1999), 785-829

[P. Mattila] Geometry of Sets and Measures in Euclidean Spaces, Cambridge University Press, 1995

[A. Naber, D. Valtorta] Rectifiable-Reifenberg and the Regularity of Stationary and Minimizing Harmonic Maps, arXiv:1504.02043

[H. Nakajima] Removable singularities for Yang-Mills connections in higher dimensions, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. 34 (1987), 299307. MR 914024 (89d:58029)

[M. Petrache, T. Rivire] Global gauges and global extensions in optimal spaces, arXiv:1302.5659

[M. Petrache, T. Rivire] The resolution of the Yang-Mills Plateau problem in super-critical dimensions, arXiv:1306.2010

[P. Price] A Mononicity Formula For Yang-Mills Fields, Manuscripta Math, 43, 131-166 (1983)

[J. Rade] Singular Yang-Mills connections, Journes quations aux drives partielles 1995 (1995): 1-15.

[R. Schoen, K. Uhlenbeck] A regularity theory for harmonic maps, J. Differential Geom. Volume 17, Number 2 (1982), 307-335.

[T. Tao, G. Tian] A Singularity Removal Theorem For Yang-Mills Fields In Higher Dimensions, Journal Of The American Mathematical Society, Volume 17, Number 3, Pages 557-593 (2004)

[G. Tian] Gauge theory and calibrated geometry, I, Annals of Mathematics, 151 (2000), 193268

[K. Uhlenbeck] Connections with Lp bounds on curvature, Commun. Math. Phys. 83 (1982), 31-42

[K. Uhlenbeck] Removing singularities in Yang-Mills fields, Commun. Math. Phys. 83 (1982), 11-29

[K. Wehrheim] Uhlenbeck Compactness, EMS Series of Lectures in Mathematics, 2004.

[B. Yang] The uniqueness of tangent cones for YangMills connections with isolated singularities, Advances in Mathematics 180 (2003) 648691

[J. Zhai] The rectifiability of singular sets for geometric flows (I)–Yang-Mills flow, arXiv:0706.0298